The Christian East

A QUARTERLY REVIEW DEVOTED TO THE STUDY OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES

SECRETARY OF EDITORIAL COMMITTEE
REVD. CANON J. A. DOUGLAS, PH.D.

Vol. XV. Nos. 3 & 4. Sept.-Dec., 1935. 3s.

PUBLISHED FOR
THE ANGLICAN & EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCN.
BY
THE FAITH PRESS, LTD.,
At THE FAITH HOUSE, 7, Tufton Street, Westminster, S.W.1.
U.S.A. and Canada 50c. $1.00 a year post free.
9d. per copy, 3s. a year post free.

CONTENTS.

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE. Compiled by J. A. DOUGLAS 65

A. & E.C.A. NOTES 70

A VISIT TO MOUNT ATHOS, 1935. By the BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR 73

THE "PATRIARHUL MIRON" ASSOCIATION. By FATHER FLORIO GALDAU 76

LIFE IN THE SACRED THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL OF HALKI. By E. EVERY 80

MTSKHETHA, ANCIENT CAPITAL OF GEORGIA. By ERIC H. KING 83

THE CONCEPT OF A SACRAMENT IN NON-AUGUSTINIAN THEOLOGY. By the HIEROMONK ALEXIS VAN DER MENSBRUGGHE ... 95

NIKEPHOROS: A RETROSPECT. By the Rev. D. J. CHITTY 107

NEWS OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES ... 120

OUR BOOKSHELF 123

CORRESPONDENCE 126

PERIODICALS RECEIVED.

Ὀρθοδοξία. Constantinople.
Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος. Athens.
Orientalia Christiana. Rome.
Πάνσωτος. Alexandria.
Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος. Alexandria.
Kol Zedek. Jerusalem.
Ἐκκλ. Ἀλήθεια Ἔτος Τεσσαρακοστὸ 17ο. Athens.
Tserkovnie Vedomosti. Karlovtsi.
Glas ... Serbia.
Ὁ Νέος Ἑσπερινός. Ὁδὸς Μακεδόνος 9. Athens.
Narodna Sveta. Bulgaria.
Biserica Ortodoxa Romana. Bukharest.
The Living Church. Milwaukee, U.S.A.
The Islamic Review. Woking.
L'Europa Orientale. Rome.
The Acolyte. New York.
The Harvard Theological Review. Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Irenikon. Belgium.
Ἐκκλησία. Athens.
Apostolat Russkoi Pravoslavnoi.

☞ NOTICE.—All communications, enquiries and subscriptions should be sent to Rev. R. M. French, St. James's Vicarage, West Hampstead, N.W.6.

THE MOST REVEREND THE METROPOLITAN KELADION OF PTOLEMAIS—TOPOTERETES OF THE JERUSALEM PATRIARCHATE, 1931—1935.

SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER 1935.] [VOL. XV. NOS. 3 & 4.

The Christian East

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE.

(Compiled by J. A. DOUGLAS.)

WILL our readers note kindly that in fact no less than in name this *is* a double number. That is to say that it contains 64 pp., not 32 pp., but 64 pp. and two pages of photos.

Its appearance without the Report of the Rumanian and Church of England Conference in Bucarest last June for the expected release of which it had been delayed, is due to the serious illness of Bishop Lucian of Roman, the Rumanian Chairman of that Conference, who fell dangerously ill on the eve of that Report's consideration by the full Episcopal Synod of the Rumanian Patriarchate. His Beatitude, the Patriarch Miron Cristea of Rumania, writes that Bishop Lucian is now quite convalescent and will present the Report at the meeting of the Rumanian Synod in the first months of the New Year.

THE PASSING OF THE PATRIARCH MELETIOS OF ALEXANDRIA. R.I.P.

Very many of the readers of *The Christian East* must have felt a sense of personal loss on learning of the death of the Patriarch Meletios, which occurred at Alexandria on Sunday, July 28th. His was one of those personalities which are never negligible. However short a contact you had with him, he left a definite impression upon you. Either you liked him greatly or you disliked him. When he willed anyone to like him, he seldom failed. In his four visits to England he set himself to win the goodwill of everyone. He met legions of us. If he failed with any of us, they were very few.

As must be the case always with sincere and forceful men, who in an epoch of crisis and transition have character, inspiration and opportunity to lead in action, he had his enemies and detractors. But the most obdurate of them cannot but agree that he played a salient part in the drama of Near Eastern history in general and of the Orthodox Communion in particular. Whatever he was, he was never a *quantité négligible*. Doubtless he made many mistakes. But we who knew him and loved him, are certain that if he risked much, he achieved much. In any case we know that he lived for a supreme vision and a great ideal and in the pursuit of which as he knew them he never failed or faltered. The compiler of this Chronicle

and Causerie, who had known him for forty years, and whom he admitted to his intimate friendship, has written a personal sketch of his career, which will appear in our next issue.

The doyen of the Alexandrian Episcopate, the Metropolitan Theophanes of Tripoli, who in spite of his having been for hard on forty years a bishop is full of vigour, has been elected Topoteretes by the Holy Synod. He filled the same office wisely, acceptably and efficiently during the difficult two years' vacancy of the Patriarchal Throne after the death of the Patriarch Photios in 1927.

We attach no importance to the messages published in some of the dailies, forecasting the raising of difficulties by the Egyptian Government in regard to the election of a new Patriarch. Soon after his enthronization the Patriarch Meletios initiated a revision of the Patriarchal Electoral Law which had been left unreformed since the election of the Patriarch Photios in 1898. That revision he carried through all its canonical stages and duly presented to the King of Egypt for ratification as far back as 1930. We understand that although that ratification had not been declared before the vacancy, Sir Miles Lampson has secured the consent of the Egyptian Government to the present election being made as if it had been declared.

In effect the whole flock of the Jerusalem Patriarchate consists of Arab-speaking Syrians. The grievances they advance and the ambitions they cherish are well known. In the Alexandrian Patriarchate there is an Arab-speaking Syrian minority—numbering not more than 30,000—some of whom advance similar grievances and cherish like ambitions. The Patriarch Meletios, who understood them and sympathized with their more reasonable demands, met them with reforms which have gone far to placate all but the more extreme among them and to liquidate the Arabophone question in the Patriarchate. The extremists are unlikely to succeed in causing trouble at the present juncture.

Among the nominees for the Patriarchal Throne are the Metropolitan Nicolaos of Hermopolis (Tanta), who as Metropolitan of Nubia visited London in 1925, the Metropolitan Christophoros of Leontopolis, who was a member of the Faith and Order Conference of 1927, Archbishop Germanos of Thyatira and the Metropolitan Jacobos of Mitylene.

The Patriarch Elect of Jerusalem.

Altogether apart from his personality and from his well-known affection and zeal for the Anglican Communion, and apart from the great value and good-will which all Anglicans have for him, we were relieved and delighted when the news came that the Holy Synod of Jerusalem had cut the Gordian knot and had elected Archbishop Timotheos of the Jordan to be the successor of the Patriarch Damianos. Whoever it might have been, we should have held it a matter for profound thankfulness that at last the Mother of Churches had a Patriarch.

But we are confident that by the goodness of God, the new Patriarch of Jerusalem will hold his high office very worthily, and will fulfil his heavy responsibilities, use his great opportunities and face the many grave difficulties which await him, faithfully, bravely and successfully.

As all our world should know the Patriarch Timotheos—his patronymic is Themelis—graduated at Oxford in the pre-War days and played no small part in the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Union which in 1916 was merged with the historic Eastern Church Association, into the A.E.C.A. He has, therefore, been a member of our Association for nearly thirty years. No Orthodox hierarch is better known in England. He has visited London frequently since the War. Thus he came with the Patriarch Damianos for the Nikæan Celebration in 1925 and was a member of the Pan-Orthodox Delegation to the Lambeth Conference of 1930. As Bishop-in-charge of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, he has shown most kindly hospitality to countless Anglican pilgrims in the past eight years. Somehow we feel that we have a part in him.

Our frontispiece is a photo of the Metropolitan Keladion of Ptolemais, who from the death of the Patriarch Damianos until last March, when ill-health constrained him to pass the office on to the Metropolitan Meliton of Madeba, had borne the heavy responsibility of Topoteretes of the Jerusalem Patriarchate. Following the Patriarch Damianos' custom, it was his wont to invite all Anglican pilgrims who rendered their devotions in the Holy Sepulchre to visit him in his monastery. His urbanity, simplicity and manifest delight in doing so endeared him to them all.

Under the Turkish Republic the elections of no less than four Œcumenical Patriarchs have taken place, each in less than three weeks after the vacancy occurred. The fact presents itself as amazing that under the British Government the widowhood of the Jerusalem Patriarchate should have lasted for over four years, that

after three years Cyprus is still without an Archbishop, and that though Egypt is within the sphere of British influence the Alexandrian Patriarchate was kept vacant from 1925 to 1927 and has again been without a Patriarch since July last. This sort of thing is injurious to Christendom as well as to the Orthodox Church. It bears cruelly upon the flocks which are deprived of their shepherds, and is no credit to the British name.

Chrestos Androutsos. R.I.P.

Even though his work be finished, the passing of a man of influence stirs the emotions. It is with sincere regret that we record the death at Athens on November 3rd of Dr. Chrestos Androutsos, whose name has been dominant among Orthodox theologians for the last thirty years. In another issue we hope to print the full data of his career and an appreciation of himself and of his achievement. Meanwhile, we content ourselves with a nutshell estimate.

One who knew him writes :—" There was nothing commonplace about Androutsos. If he had willed he could have produced novel and arresting theories and contentions which would have made his name familiar to those who ever love a new thing. But he was not that kind of Athenian. He chose for himself—or rather he was called thereto—the spadework of synthesizing the historic dogmatic teaching of the Orthodox Church and of presenting it to the modern world in an exact, logical and compendious form. Forty years ago the renaissance of the Near East had made the need of such a treatise pressing. There was nothing in Russian which met it precisely. His predecessors in the Athens Chair of Dogmatic Theology, Drs. Rhosses and Mesoloras, had made a beginning. His *Dogmatike*, published in 1907, supplied it to the full. In method, that admirable work is modern and scientific in the best sense. Always clear, definite and of the shortest statement possible, it represents amazing knowledge and research. At the same time it is palpably the product of a creative brain of the first order. Schools of thought necessarily exist among the Orthodox, and it has been challenged in principle notably by Androutsos' very distinguished colleague at Athens, Professor Dyovouniotes. But if not paramount, it gave Androutsos a name and influence which were almost paramount."

Unhappily—our movement possesses no Mæcenas—Androutsos' *Dogmatike* has not been translated into English. But a very fair idea of Orthodox dogmatic teaching as he set it forth is given in *Modern Greek Theological Thought* by Dr. Frank Gavin, who studied under him at Athens.

Anglicans will always remember that when Professor at Halki, Androutsos served as secretary of the Commission of the Œcumenical Patriarchate upon Anglican Orders which after 20 years finally

recommended their acceptance in 1922. His *Validity of Anglican Orders*, which laid down the conditions for their acceptance by the Orthodox Church, was published in 1902 as a report of the Commission.

During a visit to England in 1926, Androutsos had an informal conference at Oxford with several Anglican theologians, the notes of which ought to be published.

He was a good friend of ours. R.I.P.

The Russian Church Aid Fund.

Bishop Gore's name is dear to us all as a champion of Eastern Christendom. Accordingly we thank Miss Katherine Tudor, of Fernhurst, Haslemere, for her delightful and inspiring Bishop Gore Kalendar which gives a quotation from the Paladin's writings for every day in the year. She will send it to anyone on receipt of a 2s. postal order. The proceeds are for R.C.A.F.

Religion in Russia Under the Soviet.

Those who desire to keep informed as to what is happening in and to the Church in Russia should subscribe to the quarterly bulletin on *Life in Soviet Russia*, prepared and issued in English by the Russian Orthodox Institute in Paris and obtainable from Major Tudor Pole, Hon. Sec. of the R.C.A.F., 20, St. James's Square, W.1.

Every bulletin in the series has been of real value. But of them all none has been comparable to No. X which will appear with the New Year under the title *Russia's Religious Future*. Its author is Mr. Paul Anderson, of the Russian Y.M.C.A. House in Paris, who for real knowledge and for cautious levelheadedness has few rivals as an expert in regard to the Russian Church under the Soviet régime.

Over and above Mr. Anderson's tentative forecast of the future this pamphlet contains no less than 45 pp. of "documentation," sc. of documents, many of which are of first importance and could not easily be read elsewhere.

In fact Mr. Anderson has given us just that which we lacked, a brief and very reliable interpretative history *in petto* of the Russian Church under the Bolshevik stranglehold. If these bulletins had been published as a book, it might easily have been among the "best sellers." We advise our readers to send for a copy at once.

Contributors to this Issue.

Father Alexis was formerly a member of the Roman Catholic Community of Amay in Belgium, and is now a Russian Orthodox priest in England. His stimulating book, *From Dyad to Tryad*, is

one of the notable books of 1935. Mr. Eric King is a layman who in the past few years has succeeded in making journeys in the Caucasus. Mr. Edward Every is a young candidate for ordination who has spent the last two years as a student in the Œcumenical Patriarchate's Theological School at Halki. Father Florio Galdau of Bucarest studied under Dr. Frank Gavin in New York, is one of the liveliest inspirations of the younger Rumanian clergy, and has won the goodwill of all Anglicans by his zealous service to his Church and nation.

The Rumanian Patriarchal Cross.

The Patriarch of Rumania set a precedent last June when he conferred his Patriarchal Cross, which hitherto had never been given to anyone except to a bishop or dignitary of the Rumanian Church, upon the members of the Church of England Delegation to Rumania. The recipients were the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishops of Lincoln, Fulham and Gibraltar, the Dean of York, Canon Douglas, Archdeacon J. H. Sharp, Drs. Gavin and A. J. MacDonald and the Rev. P. Usher.

Bishop Tit Semedrea.

His many friends in England will be glad to know that Bishop Tit Semedrea has been elected Bishop of Hotin in succession to Bishop Vissarion, who himself has been translated to Czernautz in succession to our beloved friend the late Archbishop Nectarie.

A. & E.C.A. NOTES.

THE Association observed its 71st Anniversary on Wednesday, October 30th, by the offering of the Divine Liturgy in the Greek Cathedral in London. The service was beautifully sung by the Cathedral Choir and the Metropolitan Germanos officiated with five other Orthodox clergy. The Bishop of Lewes represented the Bishop of London, and a large number of Anglican priests and lay folk were present. The Orthodox clergy were afterwards entertained to luncheon by members and friends of the Association. In the afternoon, the Small Hall of the Church House was crowded at a Public Meeting, which was the best-attended Anniversary Meeting the Association has had for some years. Sir Ronald Storrs presided, and on the platform were the Metropolitan Germanos, the Mar

Shimun, the Greek Minister in London, Sir Bernard Pares, M. Sablin, the Great Archimandrite, Professor Florovsky (who represented the Metropolitan Evlogie), Canon Douglas, Mr. Athelstan Riley and others. A message of greeting and good wishes was read from the Metropolitan Evlogie, and the following letter from the Patriarch elect of Jerusalem: "Thank you for the notice of the 71st Anniversary of our Association. I remember as a deacon when I was staying in England, I had joined with all my heart the membership of our Association. Now, after many years, by the will of God, as Patriarch of Jerusalem, I give my blessing from the Apostolic See of St. James to all the members that they may progress in mutual unity and peace, fulfilling the aims of our Association, and that you may turn your minds to Jerusalem, our sweet Home. With all my best wishes."

In referring to this letter, the Chairman gave the Meeting some vivid and moving personal impressions of the late Patriarch Damianos, who had so often proved himself a kind and good friend to him during his Governorship of Jerusalem. He described the majestic dignity with which the Patriarch carried out his functions and at the same time the affectionate loyalty with which he was regarded by the simple people of his jurisdiction. The Orthodox Church had shown itself most loyal to the British Government as Mandatory Power, and he had no doubt that it was a very strong factor in the development of the country. In welcoming the distinguished representatives of the Eastern Churches who were present, he referred to the work of the Association in drawing East and West together, and wished God-speed to all its various activities.

Sir Bernard Pares spoke of Religion in Russia. The Russian, he said, is fundamentally religious. Even if he adopts materialism he will make a religion of it. If he takes Western thoughts and ideas, he recasts them in his own mind and makes them religious. Inherent also in the Russian is the sense of the family, which moulds phraseology in all departments of life, so that a general, for instance, will address his soldiers as "my children." Thus, it was characteristic of the Slavophils that they refused to accept the absolute supremacy of logic in life, and recognized the value and power of emotion and instinct. That too was the position of the mass of the Russian people. There may have been an "official" degeneration in the Russian Church of pre-revolution days, but it only concerned the "top" and did not affect the peasantry, whose religious instincts remained sound. "The reality of Russian religion is not a matter of doubt to anyone who has visited the country." The speaker maintained that the Revolution *was* religious at first, and described the restoration of the Patriarchate and the administrative reforms of the Church Council under the Kerensky régime, "which," said Sir Bernard, "put into terms of English life means Mr. Arthur

Henderson." Then was the time of real freedom. The Soviet authorities are idealists who want to make a better world according to their ideas, and according to their ideas Religion is the great obstacle before them. As a result Christ is being crucified, but also Christ is rising again, in Russia. The stupidity of the war against religion is becoming apparent to those who are waging it. The Red Army is expressing dislike of the persecution of their comrades. How far these influences have gone he could not say, but some change had taken place. The speaker had no doubt of the future. "There is a light in the heart of the Russian which will not be put out, and that light is Religion."

* * * * *

Just too late for a report to be inserted in the last issue of *The Christian East*, was the A. and E.C.A. Requiem for the late Patriarch of Alexandria. This took place on September 20th, at All Saints, Margaret Street, and was attended by Dr. Don, representing the Archbishop of Canterbury, by the Bishop of Fulham, by members of the Greek Legation, by the Russian Protodeacon, and by the Armenian Vartopet as well as by Dom Bernard Clements, the Vicar of the Church. It need not be said that the service was celebrated with the beauty and dignity everyone associates with All Saints, Margaret Street. At the conclusion, the Metropolitan Germanos assisted by the Archimandrite Virvos recited prayers for the departed to which the responses were sung in Greek by the choir. The Secretary has since received the following letter from the *locum tenens* of the Throne of Alexandria: "We are very deeply touched by your letter announcing the Solemn Requiem which was sung at All Saints Church by the officers and members of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association and the expression of their sympathy for the loss of our beloved Patriarch Meletios II. Indeed, it is a great loss not only for the Church of Alexandria and the Holy Orthodox Church in general, but for the Reunion Cause which he had so much in heart and to which your Association contributed so largely in the past few years. May our Lord and Saviour repose his soul and fill the vacant Patriarchal Throne of Alexandria with a worthy successor."

The size of the congregation was not what was to be expected on such an occasion. Why is it so much more difficult to gather people together in London, than in the Provinces? During the Church Congress at Bournemouth, for instance, the Bishop of Chichester presided at an A. and E.C.A. Reception for the Metropolitan of Thyatira, which was attended by several hundred people. At Dover, on October 23rd, there must have been between two and three hundred at a meeting addressed by the Archimandrite Virvos and the General Secretary, when the Chair was taken by the Bishop

of Dover. A Lantern Service on the Russian Church at St. Barnabas, Bexhill, on November 13th, was also very well attended.

* * * * *

The Archimandrite Virvos preached at Solemn Evensong on St. Andrew's Eve, at St. Peter's, Harrow; and he and the General Secretary afterwards spoke at a meeting of the Guild of St. Andrew, in the Church Hall.

* * * * *

His Excellency Mr. Laptew, acting Rumanian Minister in London, has accepted the position of Vice-President of the Association.

* * * * *

The A. and E.C.A. Stall at Horticultural Hall Sale, on November 6th and 7th was a great success. The Great Archimandrite visited the Sale on the second day, and gave a short address after the Bishop of London had spoken. A great many people came to our stall which was furnished entirely with ikons, old and new: and we made nearly £60. We hope to have the same sort of stall there again next year. In the meantime, it may as well be known that the General Secretary has some ikons still in hand, which can be purchased by any who will write and give a rough idea of their requirements.

* * * * *

The new booklets spoken of in our last issue are now on sale:—

The Orthodox Church, by Dr. Frere and others. 6d.

Teaching on the Sacraments in the Orthodox Church (from the Catechism of Nikolas Buljaris), by E. Mascall. 3d.

Relation of East and West since the Great Schism, by I. Young. 4d.

Our Debt to the Eastern Churches, by C. B. Moss. 3d.

Our Ideas of Ideals, by C. B. Moss. 6d.

Ikons and how they were made, by R. M. French. 4d.

A Greek Church and its Furnishing, by E. Kephala. 3d.

They are published by S.P.C.K., and may be ordered through any bookseller, or direct from the General Secretary, postage extra.

A VISIT TO MOUNT ATHOS

1935.

By The Bishop of Gibraltar.

"THE strategic position that Mount Athos occupied in Byzantine society enabled this monastic community to rise to new importance in the consciousness of the Greek people after the capture of Constantinople by the Turks (A.D. 1453). By a timely surrender

to the Mohammedan invaders the Athonites secured the recognition of almost complete political independence. . . .

" Men of letters, men of ability, men of ideals expressing a future hope of a persecuted people and the realization of the ' Great Idea ' of Hellenism assumed the garb of the orthodox monk and spread the gospel of Greek liberation along with that of Christ. For from that time onwards the Greek Church and the Greek nation fused, and became synonymous, and Athos harboured the nationalistic forces which were to break out in the Revolution of 1821 ; and, later, during the Balkan Wars."[1]

Since the last century, which saw the establishment of the Greek Kingdom, Athos has been forced to search for a new interest in life, a new ideal. Athos, called by the Emperor John, " The Heavenly City," was to be resuscitated as a religious centre, not for the Greeks alone, but for all the young nations of the Balkan Peninsula and of the Orthodox world.

On the other hand, there are forces in the modern world which threaten the dissolution of the monastic Community of the Holy Mountain. Athos is threatened with absorption by the world which it has served and nourished for centuries and the phantom of dissolution is already casting its shadow over those sacred hills and mountain tops.

The present moment, therefore, is critical and he would be a bold prophet who would foretell the future. Much, perhaps all, depends upon the new life stirring in the veins of Orthodoxy ; and upon a closer co-operation between the national groups within the bosom of the Orthodox Church. Athos, as a religious centre for Greeks, Russians, Serbians, Rumanians, Bulgarians and others, may fulfil a vital function in the future life of Christendom. Otherwise, secularization under the pressure of an expanding Greek State would seem to be inevitable.

Early on November 4th, I landed at Daphni with Mr. Laurie. As soon as the sun rose, the extraordinary beauty of the landscape, wooded hills down to the sea, became evident. There are no roads on the peninsula. We were provided with excellent mules, and in the early hours of the morning we mounted and set forth for Caryes, the capital and seat of government. After a halt at Xeropotamos, we climbed higher and higher and came for the first time in view of the romantic peak of Mount Athos (6,000 feet) at the southern end of the promontory.

Outside Caryes we dismounted. We received intimation that the Sacred Council would welcome us in person, and we entered the town on foot. As far as I am aware this was the first visit of an Anglican Bishop to Athos, and I presume that this fact gave excuse for the unusual, very beautiful and moving reception accorded to

[1] See Michael Chouka's *Black Angels of Athos.*

us. The members of the Sacred Council had assembled in the little square, together with the officials of the Greek Government, and their spokesmen in grave and dignified words bade us be guests of the Community during our stay. We moved in procession to the residence of the Council, and presently paid our visit to the Church of the Protaton, which dates from the time of St. Athanasius of Trebizond (tenth century) and contains remarkable frescoes, attributed to Penselinos (sixteenth century).

On three successive days we were enabled to visit several of the most famous monasteries, including Vatopedi, Chilandari, Zographou, Dokhiarion and Panteleimon. From place to place, up hill and down dale, in sunshine and torrents of rain, on foot or on mule-back, our kind and charming hosts accompanied us—the Iero-monk Petros of Esphigmenos and the Chief Secretary of the Council, Chrysanthos of Iviron—as well as Mr. Venetsiamos, the Government representative. Most ornamental of all our party was the Patriarchal Kavass in magnificent uniform with embroidered and pleated kilt, tight breeches and with immense rosettes on his white footgear.

Our arrival at Vatopedi, the brilliantly coloured buildings and the massive towers bathed in the light of the setting sun, were a scene never to be forgotten. The monks, a hundred or more, lined the approach to the main gateway and the wonderful bells boomed out a welcome. Upstairs we sat in the assembly room, where the last Pan-Orthodox Council had met a few years ago, and were shown the visitors' book containing the signature of our King George, who had received the hospitality of Vatopedi when serving as a lieutenant in the Mediterranean Fleet. Our Fleet is very popular among these good monks, who recall the assistance rendered by our ships after the earthquake in Chalchidice only three years ago. In the Library, we found a German and a Czech photographing the more precious miniatures; we were shown the treasures of Byzantine craftsmanship presented by Nicephorus Phocas and other Emperors, and a variety of manuscripts.

There was much curiosity about our English Church. One evening conversation turned to the question of Papal "additions" to the Creed. The Ecclesia Anglicana? Yes, it too had accepted the Filioque, I said. This proved to be too much for mine host: "No?" he exclaimed, horrified: "You mean that you . . . you . . . ?" The cup of coffee he was about to hand me was diverted; and he turned bitterly away. Presently he returned; after all, charity proved stronger than faith.

Ever since the loss of the Persian Fleet in 494 B.C., just off the Athos promontory, this sea has had a bad name. The little steamer *Kephalonia*, due to touch at Daphni on November 8th simply did not arrive. Although the other passengers were prepared to wait two, three or even four days, my friend and I determined to strike

out by an original route and to " make " Salonika, overland. During the evening we engaged, and at 2 a.m. we launched our motor-boat. The engine was noisy but not in the least dynamic. It vomited smoke in clouds, and completely screened us from our friends on the jetty, while we drifted helplessly and made no motion. Then suddenly at last the smoke cleared and a lovely shower of sparks leapt upwards to the black sky. (" That's the ' star-turn ' of Our Lady of Mount Athos," murmured my companion.) And off we raced, full-speed. Three and a half hours later we were alongside the neck of the Athos peninsula. It was still pitch dark, and much time was lost in finding a landing-place. Although so near, the shore (like the Good) seemed to be always receding. We scrambled ashore, shivering with cold, teeth chattering. No sign of life, animal or human. After a while a weird hovel loomed up in the darkness ; there was the growl of a dog ; and the solitary shepherd who emerged was pressed as guide (much against his will) into our service. Single-file we followed him—across fields, over stone walls, down through river-beds, through the dry bed of the very canal cut out by Xerxes twenty-four centuries ago.

As the sun rose we walked (or stumbled) into Jerissos, a filthy village with marvellous views to the east ; embracing Thasos, and Imbros looking like an enchanted fairyland in the farthest distance. Here we sipped coffee to revive circulation, and hired a car to Stageira, where philosophy has so turned the heads of the inhabitants that their roads are well-nigh impassable. We arrived in Salonika the next afternoon.

THE " PATRIARHUL MIRON " ASSOCIATION

A LIVING MONUMENT.

By Father Florio Galdau.

IMMEDIATELY after the War, the Rumanian Orthodox Church had to face a great many difficulties so far as the various political and religious movements were concerned. The leaders of the Church particularly found themselves in a dilemma as most of them were in some way or other connected with political parties and hence did not feel that they could take strong enough measures to suppress those very movements which were actually handicapping the Church in its work.

Notwithstanding all these difficulties, however, the Rumanian

Orthodox Church decided to set before all these movements, either political or religious, its own doctrine and attitude. As an immediate result of this stand throughout Rumania, the clergy established a great many religious associations in which both clergy and laity took up a definite attitude for the benefit of the Church. During the period 1918 to 1923, when Russian communism was so extremely powerful and when the political situation in Rumania was so uncertain, the Rumanian Church was the only powerful and united institution which took definite measures for the unification of the whole of Rumania. It is difficult, however, to say exactly how the Church took part in all these movements, but the fact remains that the Church was always active and that its beneficial influence was considerable.

Nevertheless, it was necessary to establish some association which could be led by the Church but conducted by laymen who would present on every possible occasion the doctrine and attitude of the Church concerning the so many social, cultural and political problems that confronted the whole nation.

It may be of interest to English readers to know that a former student of Oxford, Dr. V. G. Ispir, at present a Professor of Theology in the University of Bucarest, was the initiator of the missionary movement within the Rumanian Orthodox Church. He felt that the Church should be careful of whatever it undertakes but also that it should take the responsibility of presenting to all its doctrine and policy.

At the same time in Transylvania there appeared a missionary association called " The Lord's Army," which was initiated by a Rumanian clergyman, Josif Trifa, and which at first seemed to be of local character, but which little by little spread throughout Rumania. The Church considered that such an important movement should be brought under its ægis, and all those who had been so enthusiastic and so selflessly interested in the movement now began to work for the Church itself.

This movement had another practical result. At Bucarest, a Rumanian monk, Archimandrite Teofil Ionescu of the Rumanian Patriarchate, felt that in Bucarest itself, a melting pot of nations, there should exist an institution that would take care of those suffering and in need. He established in 1926, a small association, which he called, with the Patriarch's permission the " Patriarhul Miron " Association. Since the Patriarch had given his name to the Association, he became its President. This was in October, 1927.

The scope of the Association was to promote religion among the population, to know the members of the Orthodox communion better, to teach them the doctrine of the Church and to lead them to practise the Christian virtues that are the practical results of its doctrine, and to defend the Church against contrary movements, either political

or religious. This was achieved by community singing, by sermons, by social work of all kinds and pastoral activity.

The Patriarch himself felt that if the Association were to develop according to his wishes, serious steps should be taken so that it could be provided with quarters, library, printing press, canteen for the poor, and with distinguished men to lead the movement. The Association now has a library for its members of about 2,500 volumes which are given free to all those who wish to take them home. As soon as possible the Association intends to build up a public library so that this enlarged library shall be at the disposal of those who are not members of the Association and yet will come under its influence.

At present, the "Patriarhul Miron" Association edits a weekly paper *Cuvant Bun* (anglice The Good Word), which is directed by three young clergymen and four or five laymen, members of the Association. By means of this *Cuvant Bun*, the Association has established throughout Rumania its principles and the practical results of the last eight years.

Within the Diocese of Bucarest alone, the Association has established 112 branches under its direct leadership.

The missionary activity of the Association is twofold. First of all, it takes care of the evangelization of the mass of the people and of the combatting of social evils, such as intemperance, sinful living, prostitution, etc., and secondly, to take measures against all those sects that try to bring Orthodox communicants under their influence, as well as attempting to convert these people to Orthodoxy.

In order to attain these aims, the Association has been able to establish a series of groups under the leadership of a missionary, either a clergyman or a layman, and each Sunday each one of these groups goes to different villages throughout the Diocese. They take part in the celebration of the Holy Liturgy, sing together and then the leader of the group delivers a sermon for the day. The main purpose of all these sermons is to put into the hands of the people the Holy Bible and let them know how to use it and how to interpret it and also how to live according to its principles.

Another group is permanently attached to the prisons. Here they take care of the prisoners and insist on the liberated prisoners becoming members of the Association. These men are most carefully looked after, are given employment, and in most cases they repay the care and trust of the Association.

By means of pilgrimages to the many old monasteries surrounding Bucarest, the members of the Association have become acquainted with the past of the Rumanian Church and with the missionary efforts made by the old monks. Such pilgrimages have been an invaluable means of bringing to the notice of the people the ancient glories of the old Rumanian Church, its history and its doctrines, and many of the members who belong to the Intelligentia have

established a literary movement within the Association. This movement is quite strong and many of its members are university professors, clergy and other intellectuals. The pilgrimages not only proved useful in arousing interest, but the proper means of maintaining a permanent connection between the past and the present life of the Church.

The Association, however, saw the need of establishing a school. The younger members especially had to be taught the Catechism, the history of the Church, morals, the history of various denominations, music and elocution. The school was established in 1930 and the practical results of it are extremely interesting. It should be noted that theological students, especially those under Dr. Ispir's guidance, are able to put into practice their theory, so that the practical results of the missionary movement of the " Patriarhul Miron " Association can be illustrated by a series of conversions to the number of 1,099 from 1927 to 1934.[1]

The Association has also done interesting work in other directions. It has legally and religiously joined in matrimony, 2,050 couples formerly living promiscuously. Only two months ago, the Patriarch himself baptized at Giurgiu, a Rumanian Danube port, 80 Moslems and pronounced the blessing on 400 couples. I shall never forget the deep impression made on me by the mass of people who so earnestly received the Baptism and Benediction on their marriage. One case particularly was very touching—a grandmother who was baptized with her daughter of twenty-five and her infant daughter of two months. One had only to see the real happiness of these people on being received into the Church to realize the beneficial work done by the Association. I could give many other examples, but space does not allow of it. Suffice it to say that such work is going on throughout the country.

Another feature of interest in the work of the Association is the canteen for the poor, where each year 400 people are fed from December 1st to April 1st. The Patriarch himself contributes monthly Lei 18,000 in order to keep the canteen going, and most of the wealthy members of the Church give regular contributions so that all those who are in need shall find shelter and food. The Association, as well as feeding the destitute, also trains them in various crafts. It is a noteworthy fact that not one of these men, on being found a situation, has left the Association. To provide for the aged and sick, the Association appealed to the Rumanian people for gifts of food and clothes and the value of these donations is

[1]

	R.C.s	Lutherans	Calvinists	Moslems	Jews	Various	Total
1927-1928	210	50	10	15	17	54	356
1929-1930	118	13	15	12	23	44	224
1931-1934	208	79	25	36	24	156	519
	536	142	50	63	63	254	1,099

about Lei 4,000,000, all of which has been collected only through the members of the Association. The Patriarch always heads the list of subscribers and is the guiding spirit of the whole activity of the Association.

The Association has, as already stated, direct control of all its 112 branches in Bucarest, and wherever there have existed other organizations, either political or religious, the " Patriarhul Miron " Association has always attempted—and in most cases has been successful—to assimilate these and bring them under the influence of the Church. Special attention is given to the youth of the Association and its members are trained to become useful helpers of the priests throughout the Diocese. They have brought back many who had strayed from the Church as well as converted many Moslems and Jews. They have fought against such evils as pornography, immoral living and practices and other social evils that exist practically throughout all the world.

The " Patriarhul Miron " Association has also established shoemakers' workshops, weaving sheds, finds work for the unemployed, helps the poor and has a fund for sending the children of the poorest members of the Association either to the sea or to the mountains during the summer.

Financially, the Association is improving year by year.

From the above summary of the activities of the " Patriarhul Miron " Association, which represents but one single organization within the Rumanian Orthodox Church, one will realize that much has been accomplished to improve the standing of the Church, and this movement is as yet only in its beginnings. The difficulties that are ahead of our work are still very great. The world crisis has been just as badly felt in Rumania as in other parts of the world, but we are confident that in the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall overcome all obstacles and bring His Word and example to the living soul of the country.

LIFE IN THE SACRED THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL OF HALKI

By E. Every.

SCHLUMBERGER writes somewhere that if the students brought up amid the serene beauties of the Princes Islands in the study of the ancient fathers do not become accomplished priests, it can only be because their souls are *vide d'aspirations, incapable d'essor.* Such a sweeping judgment is probably unfair to any academy but

it remains true that the mystic, natural beauty of those jewels of the Marmora, the Princes Islands and the magnificent position of the school, the unforgettable views from her terrace and from her garden walks and hill (*Umit tepesi*, the hill of hope) combine mysteriously with the daily round of services and study and walks, and with the relations between teachers and taught and the Centre of Orthodoxy to form an unrivalled means of producing what is called a Church phenomena. The school has always purposed to be principally a training centre for clergy who will administrate and preach. She does not seek to produce professors and research workers in the history, literature and philosophy of religion, but rather theologians and clergy who will be preachers and teach the people of the Church.

In 1930, for the first time since the interruptions that followed the Great War, she gave forth her fruits in ordained men who had completed their seven years' course after the re-opening in 1923. In the four years since then, her former pupils have gone forth in the Church's service to occupy a great variety of positions. Among those who finished their studies in and after 1930, are the Chief Secretary and Under-Secretaries of the Holy Synod and the Librarian on the staff of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, the chaplain in Berlin and one of the Parochial Clergy in Australia, as Archimandrites, and the Archdeacons of four Metropolitan dioceses, all of these last being also travelling preachers. The Archdeacon as the principal deacon on the staff of a Metropolitan diocese, in charge of matters of preaching and often the representative of the Metropolitan bishop for the supervision of the lower clergy in general, holds a very important position with great responsibilities. There is a diocese where the Archdeacon, who very recently left Halki, is the only official of the diocese and when the Metropolitan is away is the only cleric of theological education, very nearly the only preacher, with all the accompanying responsibilities for 9,000 Orthodox people in scattered villages.

Yet Halki is not and cannot be only a "staff college." Since 1930, among her *alumni* are the librarian of the famous monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, a deacon-schoolmaster in the U.S.A., and six deacons who are preachers in parish churches in and round Constantinople. One of these belongs to the married clergy. Three more parishes propose to have theologians from Halki as deacons and preachers on their staffs this year. More openings will probably follow. The present number of students is 65. Ten completed their course last year, six will do so this year and fourteen next year. The supply of titles is very satisfactory considering all the difficult conditions.

In a previous article, some description of the seven years' programme of work was given. It is the method of the school to have, in each subject, one recognized set-book, printed or lithographed,

which has to be learnt thoroughly for questions in the classes and for examinations twice a year. In Exegetics, however, certain parts of the Bible have to be thoroughly known, with notes dictated by the Professor. But independently of this text-book work the student has also to submit a large number of exercises set to him individually at different times during his course, and at the end of the course he must submit a thesis. This work includes analyses of works of the Fathers and Church historians of the fourth and fifth centuries from Dogmatic Patrological and historical points of view. Exercises are submitted in the Bible subjects, Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Rhetoric as well as in the Fathers and Dogmatic Theology and Church History. Rhetorical exercises, of which each student performs six in his three years in the theological department, are sermons and must be delivered before the whole school. In the student's last year at services on Sundays and Holy days attended by the public, the student about to complete his course delivers his two sermons to the congregation. The practice is to write each sermon and learn it by heart. All learn to sing and take turns as singers and readers in the service of the sanctuary in the school church. Some students who desire it and are considered fit are ordained as priests and deacons to serve the school, which is a monastery, while still at their studies. These ordained men and occasionally men not ordained who are approaching the conclusion of their studies, are invited exceptionally to serve and to preach in parish churches.

There is a very extensive library in a well-ordered and well-lighted room with a large store of MSS., and a very good supply of valuable Paris and Leipzig publications, including some of the seventeenth century, and a very large amount of the Orthodox periodical literature of the pre-war period. But it has not been possible to supplement it so much in the last few years and in order to fill the gap the "students' library" has been founded. This is supported by the students' own subscriptions and supplies modern Greek literature, sermons and periodicals, and foreign literature, chiefly French sermons. Sometimes students give lectures organized by the library committee. I have given two on the Anglican Communion.

There are three citizens of the United States among the students and one student had an English secondary education in Cardiff immediately before coming to Halki. Two Cypriots also know English. Some are receiving a few English lessons in odd hours but this is very difficult at present. Even Hebrew and Russian have left the time-table since the war. Inevitably in the lower classes there have to be nine hours or ten hours of Turkish a week, including the history and geography of the world from Turkish books. In the theological classes there are five hours of Turkish on the weekly programme. This is a necessary and effective part of the preparation

of the majority of the students who are citizens of Turkey and will serve the Church on her soil. But as it is necessary also for all foreign students who intend taking the full course and being examined for certificates, and these come to Halki without knowing any Turkish, that leaves little time or inclination for other tongues except French and some Latin.

The School is supervised by a committee of Metropolitans who visit it frequently, making individual inspections of the care given to the students' food, discipline and general life, and on the scholastic side, for general education, is under the supervision of the Inspectors of the Ministry of Education. Each year on the Patronal or Dedication Feast of the Holy Trinity (Whit-Monday) and on the day of the granting of certificates to those who have finished their course, the school is officially visited by the Œcumenical Patriarch and his Holy Synod. The Patriarch always celebrates there with the Synod on the Dedication Feast. A part of the school building is His All-Holiness' residence for a month each summer. These two feasts, the services of Holy Week and Easter and the Ordinations of students are always attended by large congregations coming to Halki from all parts of Constantinople and the district.

MTSKHETHA, ANCIENT CAPITAL OF GEORGIA

Its Cathedral, Monasteries and Churches.

By Eric H. King.

DISTANT some 20 miles north-west of Tiflis, the capital of the modern Soviet Republic of Georgia and situated upon a tongue of land where the Rivers Kura and Aragva meet, lies Mtskhetha since bygone ages until the year A.D. 500 the capital of the Georgian Kingdom, said indeed to have been founded by one, Mtskhet, son of Kartlos, the great-grandson of Noah. Not only did the valleys of these rivers meet here but also the main trade routes from Persia and the Caspian Sea in the south, from the north through the Caucasus, and from the Black Sea in the west, hence its erstwhile commercial importance.

Although the capital was removed to Tiflis by the Georgian Czar Vakhtang Gurguslan in the year A.D. 500, owing to the frequency of incursions from the mountain tribes in the north, the Patriarchate was then definitely established at Mtskhetha, since here Christianity was first confessed, here the first Christian temple erected, and it was on this spot that the patron saint of Georgia, St. Nina, first

preached the Gospel of Christ to the pagan Iberians as the people were called in the early fourth century.

Of the Palaces of the Kings and Patriarchs no traces remain and it is well-nigh impossible to visualize the splendour and pomp which once characterized the Georgian Court in the poor, squalid village of Mtskhetha now consisting of a few hundred inhabitants huddled together in tumbledown houses.

Nevertheless we are here on Georgia's sacred soil, in the immemorial heart of the country since no district enshrines so many memories of its earliest history, and even to-day there still stand ecclesiastical monuments, silent witnesses to the joyous and tragic epochs of the past, to the days of prosperity and power and to the days of sorrow and defeat. I was privileged to visit and study these temples last autumn in company with the present Bishop Naproeva of Mtskhetha, a stalwart though aged champion of the fast-dying Georgian Church whose Catholicos or Patriarch suffered imprisonment at the hands of his countrymen on the outbreak of the Revolution, and who now lives in dire poverty in a dirty back street of Tiflis.

Towering majestically if sorrowfully above the wretched settlement stands the Cathedral of " Sveti Tskhoveli " or " Life-Giving Column," beneath which according to Georgian tradition lies buried the Seamless Coat of Christ.

With its simple Georgian style in massive stone, lofty conical dome of green porphyry, surrounded as it is by a high battlemented wall, the building resembles the fortified castle of some mediæval knight and, indeed, owing to the constant invasions and wars it has ever been cathedral and fortress combined, and here if anywhere the labours of peace had to be carried on with the sword ready to hand.

The origin of the " Life-Giving Column " is indissolubly bound up with the burial of the alleged Seamless Coat in Mtskhetha and with the subsequent introduction of Christianity by St. Nina, according to the following tradition which has been resolutely accepted and believed by Georgians throughout the centuries, the Holy Coat having formed the centre of the Arms of the Georgian Kingdom with the inscription below :—

"Now the Coat was without seam woven from the top throughout."

From the time of the Captivity of Babylon (600 B.C.), Jews had settled in Mtskhetha on condition that they lived outside the town and paid double taxes, and since the year 66 B.C. they maintained yearly contact with the Holy City through emissaries, so that they were well acquainted with the works of Christ during His lifetime. Thirty-three years after the news of His birth the Rabbi of the Jews of Mtskhetha, one Elios, received a letter from Anna, the High Priest of Jerusalem, stating that " He for whom the Kings came with presents calls Himself God and deserves death," and inviting

them to come and witness Christ's death; Elios thereupon set out with a large suite, but before his departure his mother begged him to take no part in any action against Christ, whilst his beloved sister Sedonia implored him to bring her something which had belonged to our Lord. At the Crucifixion, Elios stood apart from the rest, but afterwards when "for His garments they parted lots" he became possessed of the Seamless Coat; upon returning home his sister ran to meet him, and having fervently clasped and kissed it, fell dead at her brother's feet, nor could any power remove it from her grasp, a miracle which excited the people, the Czar Aderkii, himself coming to witness it. Sedonia therefore was buried with the Coat in the Royal garden at Mtskhetha and upon her grave grew a magnificent cedar.

The scene now reverts to Jerusalem nearly 300 years later, where the youthful St. Nina from Cappadocia had been studying the scriptures at the house of the old Armenian nun, Miamphora.

Here, according to Georgian chronicles, she is said to have received a vision of the Blessed Virgin who directed her to journey to Iberia where the Holy Coat was buried and to preach the Gospel to the Pagan people. Upon awakening she found laid upon her breast two vine branches in the form of a cross which she twined together with her own hair and this "Cross of St. Nina" hangs before the High Altar in the Sion Cathedral in Tiflis to-day. She reached the borders of Iberia in the year A.D. 324, preached the Gospel in the towns of Achal-Kalaki, Urbnis, and finally in Mtskhetha itself.

Here, by virtue of her miraculous healing powers, she was enabled to convert the Czar Mirian, his Queen Sadka who had long suffered from a severe illness, the Jewish priest Aviafar ("the new Paul," who became a fearless preacher of Christianity) and a host of others in the capital, which was followed by their baptism at her hands. Mirian now dispatched ambassadors to the Emperor Constantine at Byzantium, with the request that a bishop and priests might be sent to him, but whilst awaiting their arrival he decided to erect a temple in his capital, St. Nina by Divine guidance directing that the cedar growing upon Sedonia's grave be cut down for that purpose without removing the root or the Holy Coat buried beneath. When a space had been cleared in the garden the tree was felled, from the branches of which were erected six side columns, but no human hand was able to remove the trunk which was to constitute the main centre support.

As night came on, the Czar, perplexed and disappointed, returned to his palace, whilst St. Nina with others of her followers prayed before the root of the cedar that God might help Czar Mirian in his work of erecting the temple and with the coming of the dawn the saint's prayer was heard and the miracles began.

A terrible storm arose and it seemed to the frightened inhabitants

that the ridges of the mountains were falling into the rivers Kura and Aragva below, and that the waters were flooding the town which they at first attributed to the rage of the heathen gods, but St. Nina quieted them, saying that the " Mountains of incredulity are being destroyed so that the blood of human sacrifices shall cease to flow."

At daybreak an angel enveloped in radiant light, visible to the Saint alone, approached her, and after whispering three words in her ear seized the trunk in his hands lifting it " 12 ells from the earth." The Czar seeing the strange light in the garden hurried to the spot and beheld the trunk of the cedar uplifted, apparently unsupported by anybody, from which exuded a fragrant myrrh as also from the remaining stump, which immediately cured of diseases and infirmities all sick persons who touched it with true faith, this miraculous manifestation of God's power being ascribed to the Holy Coat buried beneath.

Thus this " Life-Giving Column " when lowered into position formed the main support of the first Christian church in Georgia, which was subsequently consecrated in A.D. 326 by the Patriarch Eustasius of Antioch and dedicated to the Saviour in the presence of bishops and priests who had been sent by the Emperor Constantine: so great was the pressure of the multitude that Mirian was obliged to surround the site of the cedar with a wooden fence which was replaced by a stone one, in the reign of his successor Czar Reva. In the year 378, the wooden church was replaced by one of stone by Reva's grandson Mirdat which was dedicated to the Twelve Apostles and at his time the people began to form crosses from the " Life-Giving Column." He formed one himself and constructed another stone fence around the remainder of the column which he surmounted at the top with his cross.

During the reign of the great Czar Vakhtang Gurguslan towards the end of the fifth century, Mirdat's fence which had collapsed during that of Gurguslan's predecessor Archil was replaced by the rectangular stone Column seen to-day, built around the stump of the cedar, the remains of the " Life-Giving Column " itself having been removed to the Temple of Samtavro in the north of the town where it was gradually used up to form more crosses for the people.

It was Czar Gurguslan who enlarged and beautified the Cathedral to its present appearance " for his great soul wanted to leave to posterity a magnificent memorial corresponding to the grandeur of the Caucasus and its great mountains."

The Holy Column, which occupies a prominent position in the centre of the Cathedral, is about 14 feet in height and 5 in width. It is surrounded by a grate, around and upon which lights are burning, and it is surmounted by a roof from which are suspended a number of what resemble small sanctuary lamps. It has been restored or decorated with frescoes and ikons on four occasions;

by the Catholicos Melchisedek in 1020; by Czar Alexander I, at the beginning of the fifteenth century after extensive ravages to the Cathedral by the Mongol Tamerlane, although but little damage was done to the Holy Column; by the Catholicos Nicholas in 1685, and finally by the Catholicos Anthony in 1755, who fixed two small nutwood doors at the base on which are depicted the miraculous raising of the trunk by the angel and below the recumbent Sedonia, whilst at either side are seen the haloed St. Nina and Czar Mirian. These doors used to be left unlocked so that people could place their hands within and touch the stump of the cedar; to-day they are locked and the key kept by the Catholicos himself, being only opened on the 1st October, when the miracles wrought by the Holy Coat of our Lord are commemorated by the Georgian Church in a national gathering at Mtskhetha, sadly depleted nowadays, compared with the vast concourses of the past. I was unfortunately not present at this Festival, which must be an intensely interesting one, but the following is a translation of the psalm of praise forming part of the service, composed in the twelfth century by the Catholicos Nikolas I.

> "To-day is the celebration of our Church to the Life-Giving Column and the Cloak of our Lord. The Light illuminated the world and gave to our bodies the holy myrrh. For this reason we bow to the Holy Mother of God and the Son borne by her, Christ, for the salvation of our souls. Like a conquering warrior, Holy Column, erected by God above the woven Cloak of our Lord, lighting up like lightening the heavenly Cloth, adorning those who praise you and celebrate your triumph, giving light and happiness to those who sing your praise. Rejoice, oh Column, made holy by God!"

Throughout the long centuries at intermittent periods, drops of myrrh appeared through a narrow slit near the base of the Column where the ancient stump of the cedar is preserved and which used to be caught in a cup placed on the floor below; when this healing flow dried up is uncertain, in fact, the bishop informed me that even within living memory myrrh is reputed to have again appeared and if this be true it is, of course, quite impossible to offer any natural explanation of such a phenomenon. It is a simple matter to lightly dismiss the miracle of the Life-Giving Column as fabulous and legendary, even though it may constitute a picturesque story. Personally I am by no means prepared to do so, although I freely admit that much superstition and credulity existed amongst the early Christian Churches of the East. A number of versions have been handed down to us from entirely independent sources but they only differ in minor detail, and for my own part I fail to see any reason why the Rabbi Elios should *not* have become possessed of the Holy Coat after the

Crucifixion, since there exist no well-substantiated counter-claimants and it appears to have been a fully recognized and accepted fact in Jerusalem that our Lord's tunic had been carried into the "Midnight" (*i.e.* heathen) Land of Iberia. As to the occurrences which I have related, I would only say that if, as Christians, we believe in the miraculous healings recorded as experienced by many who touched Christ's clothing with true faith during His lifetime upon earth, I fail to see why we are, of necessity, to exclude from the realms of possibility such manifestations of Divine power as are alleged to have occurred through the miracle of the Life-Giving Column, which undoubtedly crowned with success St. Nina's mission to the Iberians.

Frequent and terrible have been the attacks upon the ancient fane, levelled by the Moslem hordes invading Georgia.

Hardly had the damage wrought by the Mongol Genghiz Khan between 1176 and 1229 been restored than an earthquake destroyed the cupola in 1318 and Tamerlane swept through the land in 1400; he is reputed to have levelled the Cathedral down to its foundations, but this is a gross exaggeration as is conclusively proved by an inscription pointed out to me high up on the outer North wall, reading :—" By the will of God this temple is restored in the name of Christ by Catholicos Melchisedek. God have mercy upon Thy servants the builders of this Church. Amen." Melchisedek is also mentioned in an inscription on the East wall and as he held office as Catholicos from 1013–1042, these two walls *at least* are unquestionably those of Gurguslan restored by him.

Undoubtedly the most widespread destruction of any invader was perpetrated by the Persian Shah Abbas at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and he it was who is supposed to have removed from the grave of Sedonia the Seamless Coat and to have sent it to the great Russian Patriarch Philaret as a present to the Czar Michail Feodorovitch.

After many inquiries with doubtful results the somewhat sceptical Russians accepted it as authentic and the main part of it was deposited in the Uspensky Cathedral at Moscow, whilst smaller parts found their way to the Cathedral of the Winter Palace, the Cathedral of the Fortress of Peter and Paul, and to the Monastery of Alexander Nevsky all in St. Petersburg.

Notwithstanding claims of miraculous healings by these relics, it can be conclusively proved that Sedonia's grave has remained undisturbed throughout the passing of time.

In the first place, Philaret's description of the garment he received casts the gravest doubts upon its authenticity, "This part," he says, "seems of rosy colour, of chalky tone, and upon it are painted the Crucifixion and other passions of the Saviour with inscriptions in the Latin style." Now no mention is made in the New Testament

INTERIOR OF CATHEDRAL OF SVETI TSKHOVELI.
Showing the Holy Column in foreground.

DOORS AT THE BASE OF THE HOLY COLUMN.

of any inscription or paintings on Our Lord's Cloak and even so they would certainly have been in Hebrew or at all events in Georgian script.

In the second place it would have been utterly impossible to have secured the Coat without breaking the stone Column and removing the root of the cedar and there is absolutely no trace of their having been tampered with.

The Shah's depredations in the country were forcibly summed up in an official letter written by the Georgian Czar Teimouras to the Russian Czar in 1619, after Abbas's departure :—

"By the just, judgment and anger with our sins upon us has been inflicted : the sun became dark, and the moon was extinguished, day became night and night day. . . . To our land came the accursed Shah with many of his vile followers and destroyed our land. He desecrated many ikons of the Orthodox Christian faith, destroyed the churches of God and four great monasteries erected during the time of the Czar Feodor Ivanovitch, he burned the ikons of the saints and insulted and beat our hapless people praying to God ; he also destroyed many other monasteries, tore off the gold and silver covering from ikons and put the ikons into fire.

"The monastery of the great miracle worker, St. George, in which lived the Metropolitan, this too has been completely destroyed ; in the churches the Shah's camps were set up and in such a camp the Shah himself lived for a month, at the Throne of the Lord where it is holy. The body of our Jesus Christ he threw out of the church and the books, the bibles, and apostles and others of our Orthodox Faith, not only those in Hisa, but bringing them from far places and collecting many, he threw them into the lake. . . . It would have been better if he had not been born of his mother, but if the Lord had already created him, it would have been better if he had become stone in the womb of his mother instead of being born to do such destruction and woe ; or else it would have been better if my mother's milk had dried up and she had not reared me and I had died, so that I would not have seen such woe and seen that which my eyes have seen."

No mention whatsoever it will be observed is made of the theft of the most Holy and precious relic of the Georgian Church, nor have contemporary Georgian historians ever referred to such a national loss. On the contrary, all restorers of Mtskhetha Cathedral have unanimously affirmed that the place of burial remains untouched. In trying to establish the truth about the Holy Coat, Russian Czars have on many occasions addressed inquiries through ambassadors and have always been confronted with the same answer, namely that it remains buried beneath Mtskhetha Cathedral ; thus Czar

Alexander in an official letter to the Russian Czar of September 17th, 1635, writes, " Beneath the Cathedral of Mtskhetha the Cloak of Our Lord lies buried and remains there until this day, and may your rule be true."

Actually, it is related that Abbas upon arriving at Mtskhetha desired to destroy the Holy Column but was dissuaded from his purpose by his own Imams since " fire swallowed some of those who came near to execute this sacrilege and others it turned to flight." He is said to have thereupon sheathed his sword and after encircling the Cathedral with awe to have forthwith handed to the Catholicos a warrant for possession of all destroyed church property in Georgia.

Close to the Column is seen the ancient stone seat of the Patriarchs and also a small church in cut stone, a model of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem which marks the spot where St. Nina used to pray when she came to the miraculous cedar.

Upon the altar wall beyond the Ikonostasis is an enormous, very ancient, and magnificent painting of Christ seated between the fire-wheels of the cherubims according to the vision of the prophet Ezekiel, the right hand raised in benediction and in the left the open Gospel Book on which is written, " I am the good Shepherd and the shepherd lays down his life for his sheep." This inscription being in Greek testifies to its great age which at a later date would have been in Georgian, in which there is another below added much later (and how pathetically appropriate to-day !) " Lord, Christ strengthen Thy people that thrust in Thee ; strengthen Thy Church which Thou hast redeemed by Thy precious blood."

The present wooden Ikonostasis is modern and replaced in 1857 a former one erected by Czar Irakly II in the early eighteenth century.

The original one was of stone and I saw two ancient fragments of it propped up against the wall near the entrance, but it is not known what became of the rest of it.

Within these hallowed walls many of the sovereigns and patriarchs of Georgia are buried, though some of the graves were plundered during the Moslem invasions Czar Gurguslan lies in the centre of the Cathedral but the plain square slab bears no name for fear of such ravages.

The last of the Georgian kings, George XIII, is buried at the left of the altar and it was he who lying on his death-bed at Tiflis ceded his throne to Russia in 1801, to save his weakened country from yet a further Persian invasion.

In the north of Mtskhetha stands the Temple of Samtavro (*i.e.*, Residence of Priests), where it is believed once lived the ancient heathen sacrificers and which is more than likely since many Georgian Churches were built upon the sites of former pagan temples. It was likewise built by Czar Mirian with the assistance of stonemasons sent by the Emperor Constantine from Byzantium at his request

and within this church the first Christian Czar Mirian himself and his queen are buried.

It must have served as a model for the erection of the stone Cathedral to which it is similar though smaller and the stone carving on the outer walls less ornate. Close to it on the east side is the little church of St. Nina, of the same date—an oratory in which is said to have been her actual cell, where she lived and prayed before her cross of vine branches—and where the sick used to come and lie upon her rough bed, to be healed. St. Nina was not buried here, however, but at the monastery of Bodbé, in the province of Kakhetia, in eastern Georgia, whither she retired from the world in her declining years after her labours of conversion of the country were finished.

The Temple of Samtavro constituted a special pulpit of the Metropolitans of Mtskhetha, notwithstanding the fact that there existed the Patriarchal pulpit of the Cathedral. With the abolition of the Samtavro diocese in 1811, the residence became a convent, and towards the end of the last century the then Prioress undertook the restoration of the Temple and of St. Nina's Church, which were in danger of collapse.

A small community of devoted nuns still exists here to-day.

Some extraordinarily interesting archæological discoveries were made during extensive excavations carried out by E. Bayer in 1871, in the ancient cemetery on the lower slope below the Samtavro Temple. In his opinion, the graves of Mtskhetha belong to a Semitic tribe which is confirmed by the description given them by the Georgians of "Akeldama," already mentioned in the New Testament (Acts ch. 1, v. 19). They belong to the period about 1000 B.C. and thorough investigations led Bayer to the conclusion that not only was a human sacrifice offered in honour of every notable death but that the whole people offered human sacrifice once or twice a year to its idol. The skulls found in the graves here belong in his opinion to the long-headed type of the ancient Iberians. In these graves are also openings the size of a human head, which served the priests for binding the spirits with spells or for offering gifts to the dead, as is still a practice amongst the mountain tribes of the Caucasus to this day. The dead of Mtskhetha were not placed in coffins but in brick or tiled mausoleums, without clothes, which also proves their great antiquity.

Quite the most beautifully situated memorial to St. Nina is the Church of the Holy Cross, perched on a cliff about 1,000 feet above the River Aragva, opposite Mtskhetha, which it overlooks.

It is a stiff climb of about an hour from the village and is to-day tenanted by a solitary monk. Built in the form of a cross of brown natural stone with a flattened dome, the foundations were laid by Guram Bagratyd (A.D. 575–600), and the work continued by his son

Stepanos I in 639 ; Stephanos II, son of the latter, surrounded it with a wall with cells within it, now in a ruinous condition. There are also remains of a smaller church, known as Golgotha, on the east side close by, but I was unable to ascertain why it was built or any historical information about it. Beneath an annexe built at the north end of the main church, extending to the edge of the cliff, are cave rooms containing the bones of hermits and monks who have died there, which are, however, walled up.

The great treasure of the church, whence its name is drawn, is the Cross cut by St. Nina herself from the miraculous cedar, which cross was erected by her on this spot as being the first of four which she planted in different parts of Georgia, and this event is commemorated by a special Feast upon the 8th day after Easter. The cross occupies a prominent position in the centre of the church, and was decorated with silver work by the Czar Teimouras II in 1725, which was later removed by raiders from among the Mahomedan Lesghian tribes of Daghestan (a wild mountainous land to the east of Georgia and bordering on to the Caspian Sea, in which I subsequently travelled). It was lodged for (comparative) safety in Mtskhetha Cathedral until the year 1847, when it was restored to its former place and again decorated. The church is still spoken of locally by the name of "Djadchvis sakdari" or the "Chain Church" for there is an ancient legend that an iron chain was once suspended from the dome to that of the Cathedral below along which the more pious (or shall we say the more acrobatic !) monks went to and fro for services, but when the faith weakened among the people in later days so the chain weakened and finally broke and disappeared, having risen to heaven.

It is a curious fact that perhaps the two most outstanding figures in Georgian history were both women ; St. Nina, the patron saint, and Queen Thamara, whose glorious rule in the twelfth century raised the country to the height of its prosperity and power. I merely mention this *en passant*, as the great queen, of course, never resided at Mtskhetha but at Tiflis.

And now I come to speak of an event of great importance in the Christian history of Mtskhetha, and indeed of the whole country, namely the advent of the "13 Syrian Fathers," which took place about the middle of the sixth century. Despite the introduction of Christianity by St. Nina, it was not possible to stamp out idolatry and fire-worship amongst the people at one fell blow, and thus it came about that the Patriarch Eulavius of Mtskhetha is said to have been directed from On High during his sleep to summon to Georgia the renowned Father John and his twelve apostles or followers from Syria, to fortify and propagate the Faith, and who reached Mtskhetha about the year 557, where they were shown the Holy Column erected over Sedonia's grave, subsequently preaching in the capital. Father

John next decided to establish himself upon the mountain known as Zedazeni, a rugged crag rising about 3,000 feet to the north-east of Mtskhetha, the name being derived from the idol of the god Zaden (Zeus or Jupiter), which had been erected by the Czar Farmadgeon in the year A.D. 109 at the summit and to which the people still brought their offerings.

To John's request to settle here, Eulavius replied, " Desolate is that mountain because of the loathsome idol of Zaden, and that place of heathen worship is still full of evil spirits." In his *Life of John of Zedazeni*, the Patriarch Arsenius in the eleventh century wrote :— " Having blessed the Mother of Georgian cities (Mtskhetha) with his teachings, Holy Father John, the eye of Fathers, ascended the Zedazen mountain, for which his soul was longing and he exhorted his disciples and said, ' Go forth and establish the Christian herd in the faith in this newly cultivated land.' " John and his followers are said to have crossed the Aragva at a time of terrific floods, which, however, subsided at his bidding.

There is no doubt that the Syrian Fathers must have proved a dynamic force in the land ; the exploits of his apostles in different parts of the country are outside the scope of this article, but as for Father John and his deacon, Elias, they set about the immediate destruction of the idol and altars of sacrifice to Zaden and we are told that by their teaching, miraculous healing, and saintly lives they eclipsed the memories of the heathen god and that vast concourses thronged the mountain slopes. They are believed to have at first lived in small caves hewn by themselves, one of which formed a shrine, but later with the aid of his converts John built upon the site of the former pagan temples the Monastery of Zedazeni.

It was not without difficulty that I persuaded the bishop to embark upon the ascent of the mountain, which possesses an extremely unsavoury reputation to-day.

However, I told him that I placed complete reliance upon his spiritual powers to ward off the evils—both biped and quadruped—of which folk in these parts were so apprehensive and my arguments were reinforced by a substantial cash consideration which was not to be despised, for the Georgian clergy are to-day compelled to exist on little more than the thin, if glorious air of the Caucasian mountains. Thus it came about that the bishop and I, together with one of the monks from the Cathedral and a peasant, set forth from Mtskhetha equipped with blankets and provisions for the heights of Zedazeni, upon a hot and cloudless afternoon at the end of October.

It proved a rugged and strenuous route for there is no guiding path to-day along this erstwhile " Pilgrims Way " consisting largely of the dried-up beds of mountain streams, which for centuries was trodden by the devout on the 7th May when John of Zedazeni is commemorated in the Georgian Calendar. About half-way up the

wooded slopes stands a little ruined church, once a resting-place for the Pilgrims and a very welcome one for us also !

We reached the summit as darkness was falling, entering the monastery domain through a ruined arch standing gaunt and stark in the dying light, and were welcomed by the two monks who, together with the monastery pony, constitute the sole inhabitants of Zedazeni to-day. It would appear that no foreigner has hitherto visited the mountain within living memory, so that the astonishment of these ragged, dirty, yet saintly and kindly old men can well be imagined at our totally unexpected arrival and who later devoured with a relish the provisions we had brought since they contrive to exist on such vegetables as they are able to grow, supplemented by what they can obtain from Mtskhetha on the rare occasions when they descend from their remote mountain retreat.

A dilapidated wooden shack built into the crumbling remains of the outer wall of the monastery, constituted our sleeping quarters and a few trusses of hay our bed.

Never have I witnessed a dawn so glorious as that to which I awoke, nor a panorama so magnificent as that which lay at my feet ; Tiflis far distant to the south, Mtskhetha itself directly below, the Kura and Aragva winding their tortuous courses through the fanciful contours of the mountains to the north, whilst in the far distance rose the snow-covered, majestic Mount Kasbek, one of the loftiest of the great peaks of the Caucasus (16,546 feet), the whole bathed in the almost unearthly beauty of the break of day. I was now able to take stock of my surroundings.

Encircling the little plateau are hoary fragments of the ancient wall, otherwise nothing remains of the monastery buildings except the small church with a room adjoining at one side, now used as the refectory and upon the other side another room which serves as sleeping quarters for the two monks.

The church was restored in 1849, by the late Exarch of Georgia, the Most Eminent Isidor and again in 1889, by the Most Reverend Alexander the then Bishop of the Georgian provinces of Guria and Mingrelia. It was dedicated to St. John the Baptist and the main chapel to St. John of Zedazeni where I was shown his tomb and that of his deacon, Elias.

The spirit of John is said to haunt the mountain to-day, which I can well believe, considering the sorry pass to which the Faith in Georgia has descended, for which he strove so nobly in those bygone ages.

It is related that when he first took up his abode here, there was no water and that Elias had to descend the mountain to procure it, which he not unnaturally found extremely fatiguing, wherefore, John prayed that water might appear and the spring which still exists is believed to have constituted the answer to his supplication.

Even to this day the handful of peasants who visit his shrine on the 7th May, drink from a small reservoir in the nave of the church, where the water is stored. This spring is mentioned in the chants of the Georgian Church. A narrow path leads about 20 feet below the summit on the western side, to three small caves hewn out of the limestone rock, in one of which is a crude table also carved out the rock and in all probability it was from these confined spaces that John and Elias originally conducted their ministry on Mount Zedazeni. We descended the mountain by a shorter though steeper route and reached Mtskhetha without having encountered any sign of life—human or otherwise—upon these desolate slopes. I have not, however, the slightest doubts but that the bishop's fears were fully justified, since the sinister reputation of Mount Zedazeni is well known even in the town of Vladikavkaz, nearly 150 miles distant, in the northern Caucasus.

Alas! In all human probablity another generation hence, all these temples of the erstwhile powerful and autokephalous Georgian Orthodox Church will constitute no more than silent memorials to her past glories.

Shortly after the downfall of the Georgian Kingdom at the beginning of the last century, the Church became more and more oppressed by Russia, her autokephaly abolished, her property sequestrated; to-day, her Seminaries closed, her clergy downtrodden and despised, to whom can she look for help, and who is to save her from utter disintegration?

Truly has her close communion with the Church of Russia—a communion forced upon her in direct violation of the Treaty of Union—inevitably engulfed her in a similar fate.

THE CONCEPT OF A SACRAMENT IN NON-AUGUSTINIAN THEOLOGY.

By the Hieromonk Alexis van der Mensbrugghe.

IN speaking, in this article, of the Augustinian view of sacramentarian theology, I have deliberately refrained from calling it "the Western view" without qualification. That it has now become officially the Western view is a sad fact, but it certainly was not always accepted universally in the West. Pre-Augustinian theology on the question of the general theory of sacraments (what Roman theologians aptly call the theology "*de sacramentis in genere*") was identical in East and West. Even long after Augustin's outlook

had been accepted by Western theology, Canon Law and Liturgy were still following the older traditional view. A tension between theory and practice had to follow, and it led to the amazing chaos to which the Middle Ages testify in regard to reordinations.

There are two fundamental principles in the general theory of a sacrament as it is understood by the ancient churches of Catholic tradition: the one is the principle of subordination of the minister to the right church; the other is the correct celebration or administration of the external rite or ceremony. The whole difference between the old traditional view (which we call non-Augustinian) and the Augustinian view consists essentially in the subordination of these two principles. Abbé J. Saltet in his book *Les Réordinations* (Paris, 1907)[1] sums up very well the Augustinian attitude: "The Church's doctrine is the result of two principles. On one side it asserts that the efficacy of the sacraments is objective, *i.e.*, independent, where essentials are concerned, of the dispositions of the minister and subject. Secondly it proclaims the necessary subordination of the minister and of the subject of the sacraments, first to God and then to the Church. Looked at from this point of view, it is clear that of the two principles so combined it is the first one, concerning the objective efficacy of sacraments, which plays the first part (*qui a l'influence prépondérante*); the subordination of the minister to the Church is given the smallest part possible (*est maintenue dans la mesure la plus réduite possible*)" (p. 4).

Now this view goes straight against the tradition which alone occupies the field before Augustin both in East and West, a tradition which might exactly be defined by reversing the emphasis stretched above, and by subordinating the objective value of the sacramental rites to the relation which minister and subject hold towards the Church.

We have here an excellent example of the utter impossibility to distinguish between substance and emphasis, as if the first were important and essential, and the second of no import. Emphasis *is* substance. It *is* a different thing to be served a cup of black coffee with just a hint of milk, or to be served a cup of milk with just a hint of coffee. Just as the scientific analysis of substances finds them all finally homogeneous atoms differentiated only by structure, *i.e.*, emphasis, so in our case the two emphases mentioned give us disastrous divergences and irreducible realities.

[1] This book is an excellent repertoire of the historical evidences bearing on the general theory of the sacramental principle; its interest out-reaches by far the promise of its actual title. It is a pity that while the Western vicissitudes are studied up to the fifteenth century, the study of the Eastern Church's practice is unfortunately confined to the seven first centuries only. As for the interpretation of the facts, the author being hopelessly bound to the Augustinian outlook, is obliged to find fault and a lack of logic with ecclesiastical jurisprudence every time this does not square with the official (Augustinian) view of Roman modern theology.

I.—To give efficacy to the sacrament apart from its context (*i.e.*, without considering the sacrament as an act of a minister, the minister as a minister of a certain church, etc.) is to abstract it from the complex which is *the* reality. Such an abstraction leads straight to mechanism and magic, as it refers the sacramental value of the whole to the material action exclusively. A modern Roman Catholic theologian in Austria, Dom Winzen, wrote recently an article[1] to show that the theory of the "*opus operatum*" of a sacramental ritual did not mean really more than an affirmation of God's primacy and soleness in granting grace. But it is not to the ritual act to emphasize this side at all. What it emphasizes, on the contrary, is the "*opus operantis*" side of the sacramental efficiency. Our Lord never did a miracle without requiring some definite dispositions of the bystanders and in most cases an external act of faith was required as well. As Elisha bade Naaman the Syrian to go and bathe in Jordan, so Our Lord bade the waiters to fill the jars before he changed the water into wine; and so again He bade the men to take the trouble of rolling the big stone away from Lazarus' grave before ordering him to come out. Such human contributions are nothing in the actual production of the miraculous effect, they do not interfere with God's primacy and uniqueness. Yet they are acts of confidence and trust required for the fulfilment of the divine purpose. We may call this a human "agitation" when compared with God's "Act," or we may call the man's part a *causa secunda*, or *instrumentalis*, or *dispositiva* or *oboedientialis*, or any such term, but we cannot leave it out altogether. So in the sacraments it is the "*opus operantis*" (rite) that conditions and guarantees the "*opus operatum*" (grace), or if we like to modify the expressions: it is the "*opus operantis hominis*" that engages the pre-existing "*opus operantis Dei*." The point of importance is that the *ex opere operato* must be really a *human* act, not only a mere external ceremony, however correct. And more than that: the act must not only be of a man, of any man, but of a *qualified* man, of a *minister*, in other words of a *church*. It is essentially an "*opus operantis Ecclesiæ*."

The grace of God then comes from God alone through the channel of the Church whose minister has to represent her authoritatively. To forget all this is to restrict the full meaning of a sacrament, as we understand the word and as the catechisms still define it. A sacrament is "an efficacious sign of grace." It is a component of two elements: the sign *and the grace*. The whole mistake of S. Augustin was to distract the attention from the complex (sign × grace) to one element of the complex only, and to refer the full meaning of "*mysterium*" (the grace-giving sacrament of colloquial speech) to the material rite only (the *sacramentum* of technical language). To leave the grace (or *virtus* or *res*) hanging in the air, and to attribute

[1] *L'Eglise comme Mystère, in Œcumenica, avril*, 1935.

any self-sufficiency to the rite as such, is to slip from the full meaning of a sacrament to the narrow meaning of the technical "*sacramentum*" (the rite); it is not only an abstraction of one element *from* a whole, an abstraction that deadens it *ipso facto*, but it is taking that element *for* the whole, it is a fallacy of "*pars pro toto*."

Since Augustin a sacrament for a Western theologian (I do not say for the faithful who keep to the fuller notion) is a religious and symbolic ceremony reverently performed, whether giving a grace or not. The grace may come as an epiphenomenon. In non-Augustinian theology, Eastern and Western, a sacrament, as its definition emphasizes, is a mystery; it is only a sacrament, it is only valid, it only exists when it is actually giving grace. This is a first and essential discrepancy in the use of terms.

II.—I have just used the word "valid," and I must haste to say that I have used it in a Western sense. For here again we have an irreducible discrepancy between the Augustinian and the non-Augustinian views of validity.

For Augustinian theology, "Validity or Invalidity" means "To be or not to be." For a sacrament to be valid is to be, to exist; to be invalid is simply not to exist at all. In the non-Augustinian view, the word has kept its etymological meaning: to be invalid (*invalidus*, ἀβέβαιος) does not mean to be dead, but to be an invalid, to be weak. An invalid sacrament in the oldest ecclesiastical language is something uprooted, upset, unsteady; it is something you cannot rely upon. It is in this sense that Tertullian spoke of schismatic ordinations as "*leves et inconstantes*" (*de præscriptione hæreticorum*, 14).

When we multiply this discrepancy in the meaning of the term "valid," by the discrepancy noted on behalf of the term sacrament, the jarring of the two theologies is now squared; they become hopelessly out of tune. For instance, a theologian of the Augustinian tradition will say of a baptism performed *bona fide* outside the true Church that the "sacrament is valid." The non-Augustinian will say that the rite by itself apart from the minister's qualifications being no guarantee of grace, he would not call it a sacrament at all. But he would qualify that first statement. He would add: as far as even your schismatic body still remains in the true Church to a certain extent (for we shall see later that dissent is not so much to be gauged by canonic standards as by the amount of true tradition still living in the dissenting body), your rite may be grace giving to a certain extent. In so far I may call your act a sacrament. But even then I shall have to call it an *invalid* sacrament, for that amount of grace which it may convey outside the full adherence to the "Œcumenica" can never be the "*mensura plena et conferta et coagitata*" of the "Œcumenic" sacrament. In so far yours remains necessarily "invalid" (weak).

III.—This leads us to the examination of another series of distinctions that are usually met with in sacramentarian theology. They are those of (1) divine or ecclesiastical ordinance (*lex dominica, lex ecclesiastica*), of (2) power of order (*potestas ordinis*) and power of jurisdiction (*potestas jurisdictionis*), and of (3) validity and legitimity.

In non-Augustinian theology these three pairs have a very simple connexion. The two last are only two aspects of the first. The first is the utterance of a general principle, and the two last are only two reflections of that general principle in the performing minister and in the performed sacrament respectively.

In the Church we find divine ordinances (*leges* or *institutiones dominicæ*) and ecclesiastical arrangements (*leges ecclesiasticæ*) concerning those divine ordinances. The second are not additions to, but specifications of, the first. When the divine command tells us to worship God with our whole soul, and when the Church tells us to go to Church at least every Sunday (can. 11 Sard.; 80 Trull.), the second ordinance does not make number with the first. It stipulates only the way in which the first will find a decent or sufficient expression. We find, for instance, that by divine commission any bishop is a bishop for the wide world with no geographical restriction inflicted on his power. If, however, ecclesiastical provinces and dioceses have been established, this provision is of pure ecclesiastical origin; it is of their own decision that the bishops have decided to fix a boundary to the exercise of their power. Again, if we pass to the priest who receives his power through the mediacy of the bishop, we find a power given unto him by virtue of the ordination itself, a power entrusted to him by the bishop as the direct bearer of the divine commission; and we find a limitation of the exercise of that power to a certain area or to a certain flock ascribed unto him by the bishop as holder himself of a restricted ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

If, finally, we turn from bishop or priest to the sacraments performed by them, the distinction of validity-legitimity found here is for non-Augustinian theology a direct reflection of the distinction of order and jurisdiction in the minister. If the minister has the power of order the sacrament must be and can only be valid; if the minister goes out of his jurisdiction, the sacrament administered by him becomes illegitimate or irregular (*irritum* = vexing). But any amount of irregularity cannot take away the validity as we have understood it, that is the real sacramental value of an act performed by a true minister of the Œcumenical Church. If a priest ordained in the Œcumenica happens to absolve without a licence or marry people without the authorization of their parish priest,[1] or if a bishop happens to ordain irregularly outside his diocese, such irregularities

[1] I suppose here that the minister of marriage is the priest, *not* the contractant parties.

can never be more than irregularities. They may find excuses of *force majeure* or they may find no excuses and the offender then has to submit to canonical sanctions; but the irregular sacrament remains valid as far as its offending minister has not "vexed" the Church so much that the Church has rejected him from herself by excommunication. Only then does he cease to administer "validly." (But even then, as we saw in Section II, will his "invalid" sacraments have to be treated as "weak," not as non-existent.)

Instead of this simple outlook, Augustinian theology presents us here with a contradiction and with a mistake. With a contradiction, because the value of the ecclesiastical commission is so strongly emphasized where a minister "inside" the Church is concerned that the absolution or the marriage spoken of above would be considered as invalid (in the Augustinian sense of non-existing); while the rejection of a minister by the Church is so unduly minimized as to leave the validity of subsequent sacraments unimpaired. For the Augustinian view the graver case carries with it the smaller consequences. But there is more here than a contradiction, there is fundamental mistake as well. If the Church is legislator of her own commissions (jurisdictions), she is the holder of the divine commissions (orders) as well. The œcumenical episcopate that takes a part in every ordination of bishops and priests is both the joint commissioner of the divine *potestas ordinis* and the maker of its own *potestas jurisdictionis*. Excommunication means then more than the withdrawal of the ecclesiastical commission; it is the withdrawal of the divine commission, too. This view, of course, knows nothing—and rightly so—of the Augustinian invention of inamissible "characters."[1] It stresses the fact that jurisdiction is an ecclesiastical qualification, of a practical order, of the divine and apostolic *potestas ordinis*. It is neither a second power to be added as extraneous to the first, nor is it of divine origin as the first.[2]

IV.—The Augustinian bias of reducing the importance of the conditions of ministry in favour of the correctness of rite knows a limit. It is generous enough to admit the necessity of a minimum of dependence of the minister on the Church. But whereas non-Augustinian theology finds an epikeia for schismatic and heretic sacraments in admitting that even the worst grades of schism and shades of heresy still live on a dilapidated capital received from the Church and so far still depend on her, the Augustinian view finds its epikeia for the schismatic and heretic in another quarter. The

[1] The theory of the character has never given a satisfactory answer to the objection that if the Church can cancel the divine grace which was dispensed through her, she can cancel a divine appointment (status) conferred through her.

[2] This view of the jurisdiction as here developed is, of course, quite independent of the further question whether its authorized bearer is finally Episcopate (the Orthodox view) or the Roman Patriarch (Roman Catholic view).

dependence of the "outsider" is found in his right "intention" to administer the sacraments of Christ and His Church. But to ground the epikeia on this basis is an error. Why?

Here again the Augustinian, for the second time, commits an unwarranted abstraction. He takes as granted that a minister can have the intention to do what Christ did or what the Church does, without entering into the question of the faith of the minister. To *know* exactly what Christ intended to do is irrelevant to the ***wilful*** repetition of that intention. A Roman Catholic theologian to-day accepts as valid the baptism of a child performed by a pagan nurse who would know nothing of the Christian Faith, but would just do as she was told to do by the dying mother of the child, provided the nurse realizes vaguely that the ceremony has something to do with the religion of the mother, and provided, of course, she performs the ceremony quite satisfactorily. The pagan nurse wants to do what the mother wants to be done; the mother wants to do what her priest would have meant to do if he had been available; the priest wants to do what the Church does, and the Church intends to do what Christ wanted to be done. This cascade of linked intentions is perfectly consonant with the Augustinian view. For the traditional non-Augustinian theology it is inadmissible because its starting-point is completely inadequate.

Against the Augustinian view we have that of S. Athanasius. Does faith in Christ, as right outlook on Christ's place and work in the world, affect the nature of faith, as link of the will between the minister and Christ? In other words, has right faith (orthodoxy) a bearing on right intention? S. Athanasius is emphatic: it does. The coupling of right intention with wrong faith is only tolerable as far as we are facing a *conditional* and *agnostic* repudiation of the orthodox faith. As far as we have an unbeliever who says to himself: "I do not know whether Christ was God or not, but whatever He was I want to do what He told us to do," the sufficiency of his intention might be allowed to pass *à la rigueur*. Unfortunately most views of heretical ministries are not built on the pattern of such a gentle and cautious abstention. Suppose a positive stubborn unbelief in the divinity of Our Lord such as the Arians of the left wing held, and the intention "*faciendi quod fecit Christus*" becomes impossible. What the Arian really does is to substitute for Christ a Christ of his own fancy. If Christ the God *is* the historical Christ, then the Arian Christ to which the Arian hooks his intention has never existed; he is a mere *figmentum humanum*; and the Arian only intends to do what a *phantom* Christ of his own make, *if* He had ever existed, *would* have meant to do. That is why Athanasius insisted that a *βεβαία* salvation was only to be assumed both in connexion with a *de facto* divine Christ, and in connexion with a belief in that divine Christ. Faith—right faith—is a *necessary* bridge from

Christ to the Church, or according to Our Lord's own words it is the very rock *stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiae*.

Abbé Saltet says of S. Athanasius: "Two very different arguments are to be found in S. Athanasius: By denying the divinity of the Son, the Arians compromise (1) baptism as such, (2) their own baptism. The first proposition is inattackable . . . the second, taken *au pied de la lettre*, is erroneous" (*op. cit.*, p. 44). But surely, if there is no will without an object, and if, as we saw, ideology informs the will by defining its object, then the Arian ideology compromises both the very idea of baptism and the particular Arian realization of it.

V.—The notion of the "character" is a corollary of the Augustinian attempt to root the immutable validity of a sacrament once and for all in the correctness of the rite. Some sacraments give not only grace for a definite and transient circumstance, but place a man in a *status* which endures. For the non-Augustinian it is quite simple that to be entitled to the enduring privilege does not mean that the privilege cannot be lost. An appointment is made once and perdures although the appointment can be withdrawn and this applies as well for appointments made by the Church as Christ's minister conferring this *potestas ordinis*, as for appointments made by the Church as a human body taking its own canonical dispositions. For the Augustinian, however, the status once received is never lost.

When a small body actually withdraws from the Œcumenica, what is its position? What power is there left in it? The Augustinian line of thought reduces (as we have seen) the validity of a sacrament to the correctness of a rite once performed and to a certain continuance of right intention on the part of the dissenting ministry. Along such a line it hopes to grant a certain epikeia to dissent. The result is (1) to accord to sacraments "*extra Ecclesiam*" *complete* recognition of validity and (2) to reduce the notion of a sacrament as "mysterium" to the sacrament as a sign, or as the scholastic will say, to "a matter and a form."

The non-Augustinian tradition not only knows nothing of the inamissible character, but can never have anything to do with a principle that ruins the emphasis on the dependence of the minister to the Œcumenic Church. Does that mean that the non-Augustinian is committed to withdraw haughtily into his shell and declare all dissenting sacraments null and void? Not quite. He, too, has an epikeia in their favour, as well as the Augustinian, but not such a one as would ruin the very principle of the all importance of the true and œcumenical Church: *Extra Ecclesiam nullum sacramentum*. But secession from the Church need not be conceived in a mechanical way. The faithful are not attached to the Church as a necklace that is put on and off at will. They are not out or in the Church as a door is open or shut. Dissenting is not so much a break of canonical

allegiance as a gradual abandonment of the Church faith and inner life. Dissenting admits of grades, and, however much dissenting points are at stake, there remains always something at least that leaves the dissenters members of Christ's Body. However much gets lost from the full traditions of Orthodoxy there is always a positive residuum of it kept and that is the positive value by which their impoverished life is gauged in the eyes of God. I have insisted elsewhere[1] on the fact that Faith is a whole, and that to lose one article of it is to distort the rest which you want to keep, because what remains has to be stretched and twisted to make it cover all the requirements of the Christian life. And only a complete creed is really adequate for such a need. Yet what is kept of the Creed, although spoilt, is not destroyed. Although blurred and mutilated and distorted, the Face of Christ is not effaced in the schismatic or even the heretic. Dissent may gradually become numb and paralysed to the flux of the fuller life of the Church, it may get sick to death, its recovery may be quite hopeless, yet you cannot in fairness call it dead. You cannot simply ignore it, wash your hands and leave the dissenters to the uncovenanted mercies of God as if they were mere pagans. It is the Body of the Church that suffers from the dead weight of those paralysed members, not those members themselves. They are numb! And the Church suffers, exactly, because they *do* belong to her and because it is on her vitality that they feed and her life that they waste.

So we need no theory of "character" in order to find a *rationale* for epikeia towards dissent. But there is more. The very procedure taken by the Church when dissenting bodies return to her bosom flatly contradicts the theory of "character" at least where Confirmation is concerned. How, indeed, does such a healing take place? By submitting the same member to a higher pressure of Church life, by tightening it closer to the full Œcumenical Spirit, by revitalizing in the numb member the sensitiveness to responsible citizenship, by submitting it again to the very sacrament of Œcumenicity, viz., to Confirmation.

The ceremony of the imposition of hands and invocation of the Holy Ghost used in all cases of Reconciliation has been exhaustively shown to be, historically speaking, a replica of Confirmation. And the latter attempts to distinguish between Confirmation and Reconciliation (or Penance) on the ground that the first entails a consignation with chrisma while the second does not, do not stand the test of historical enquiry. Penance has no consignation because when and where Reconciliation first occurred, Confirmation had none either, and Penance has kept since to the oldest and more austere ritual. But in both Confirmation and Penance the imposition of hands to

[1] *Le Danger de Formalisme dans le Mouvement de Réunion*, in *Œcumenica*, Vol. I, No. 4, *janvier*, 1935.

imparting of the Holy Ghost and the meaning of the prayers testify to the instauration or restauration of the full privilege of responsible citizenship, to the investment or re-investment of a spiritual *toga virilis*, to an ordination or re-ordination to the "order of laity" (S. Bulgakov) as opposed to the irresponsibility of childhood which is conferred in baptism.

All that Pope Stephen, in the third century, required from the Novatians, laymen *or* clerics, was that "*impositio manuum in paenitentiam*" (*cf.* S. Cypr., Ep. 74, c. 1) which the correspondence of S. Cyprian on the subject proves to have been an imposition "*ad accipiendum Spiritum Sanctum*" as well (S. Cypr., Ep. 72, c. 1). Saltet says that this is a proof that S. Stephen accepted the Augustinian view of the efficacy of a sacrament *extra Ecclesiam*. But this is to read Augustin's view back into Stephen's action. In reality Stephen's view has nothing to do with the Augustinian theory of the efficacy of sacraments outside the Church. It is a rash conclusion, because S. Cyprian and Pope Stephen quarrelled on a *practical* issue, and because S. Cyprian and S. Augustin quarrelled over the *theoretical* issue, to deduce that Pope Stephen and S. Augustin were agreed on the principles. The fact is that although S. Cyprian and S. Augustin represent the opposite principles (of dependence of minister on Church and sufficiency of the correct rite, respectively), they both criticize bitterly Pope Stephen. But it is not sufficiently emphasized that they criticize him on contradictory grounds, and this should be a hint that Stephen's view was really different from both others. S. Augustin, and S. Jerôme after him (Contr. Luceferianos, Migne P.L. 23, col. 161), ask why Stephen admits the schismatical baptism and does not admit the schismatic confirmation as well. The criticism of S. Cyprian is just the opposite: Why does Stephen deem schismatic confirmation insufficient and does he not deem schismatic baptism insufficient as well? In fact it is S. Cyprian and S. Stephen, not S. Augustin and S. Stephen, who act on the same principle: *Extra Ecclesiam nullum sacramentum*. It is a principle which they have received from Tertullian and from the sixty-ninth canon of the Apostles, and it is a very sound principle indeed. In this they are both firmly anti-Augustinian. Where Cyprian and Stephen begin to disagree is in the application of the principle. For Cyprian the lawyer, assent to or dissent from the Church is defined by the mechanization of canonical allegiance. It is a question of all or nothing. For Stephen the *discessio* admits of infinite grades. It presents all the slow characters of an organic disease.

Exactly the same procedure is followed in the fourth century, and now not only towards schismatics as the Novatians but towards heretics as the Arians. Both are reconciled by the same ceremony of Reconciliation which we have seen to be a re-validation, a recovery

of Confirmation. Recovery is an excellent word, for it shows how one can speak of the "new" life of convalescence where death strictly speaking has not taken place. (For this period, refer to Canon 8 of Nicæa which distinguishes clearly between the χειροθεσία (Confirmation) which shall be repeated and χειροτονία (Ordination) which shall not be repeated; Concil. of Alexandria, 362; Conc. Arles 314, can. 8; the directions given by Pope Siricius to Himerius of Taragona in 385; the letter of Theophilus of Alexandria to Flavius of Antioch, *circa* 400.)

Latter vicissitudes of practice will reveal themselves to the historian, but only one of them will bear on the question of principle. Canonical and liturgical practice in the West at the time of the rehabilitation of the Arians in Gaul and Spain will be puzzled before the fact of a reconfirmation that revitalizes Arian orders as well as Arian baptisms and confirmations. It was led to imagine that Ordination had to be reconferred once Confirmation had been impaired. So they reintroduced Reordination after Reconfirmation or Reconciliation. This was, however, a mistake based on a misunderstanding of the nature of Confirmation as the Sacrament or Order of "Laity." The privilege and responsibility which constitute the *rationale* of Confirmation are assuredly the basis to further hierarchical responsibilities. Yet it was a mistake to believe that the decay of the basis meant *ipso facto* the collapse of the superstructure. We have seen to-day the foundations of more than one ancient monument reconditioned without necessitating the demolition and reconstruction of the whole edifice.

* * * * * * *

So much for the general *theory* of the sacramental principle. When *in practice* it comes to extreme cases, it may become impossible to estimate exactly whether a given case of dissent has reached such a hopeless condition and provoked such an irritation, that it would be better to amputate than to heal, better to create anew than to reshape a monstrous difformation. How far, for instance, is the Quaker's outlook still Catholic? How far is the Calvinistic Lord's Supper, without the sacrificial and "*ex opere operato*" values, still a sacrament of Christian unity? Correct answers to such questions may be impossible. The gauging of Dissidence may differ according to the experts, just as one doctor would give up a case which another would not yet abandon. It is natural that in utmost cases some ecclesiastical authorities have decided for the renewal of all sacraments instead of being satisfied with the sacrament of Reconciliation.

So we need not be very upset when we see that the mild ordinances of Nicæa in favour of the Novations (can. 8), of the Paulinians (can. 19) and of the Meletians (Letter of the Council to the Egyptians

in Socrates, Hist. Eccl. I, 9, Migne P.G. 67, col. 180)[1] are forgotten a century later. Already Theophilus of Alexandria in his letter to Flavius of Antioch (can. 400) restricts the Economy of Reconciliation to Arians only, refusing it to the Paulinians. Paulinians, however, were probably Sabellianizing, and if so their faith was very near freezing-point. But so was Arian faith! It is the Church of Constantinople that in the fifth and sixth centuries is the less lenient. When Martyrius of Antioch (459–471) is consulting the Great Church on the question of reintegrating schismatics and heretics, they send him an elaborate recommendation to admit the baptism of some of them, the baptism and confirmation of some others, and finally to admit baptism, confirmation and orders of a third category. But when the historian tries to find a *rationale* for that complicated classification he is baffled. In the sixth century we know the drastic severity of the patriarch John the Scholastic (565–577) and his "*zelus amarus*" to trick monophysite bishops as John of Ephesus and Paul of Aphrodisias into reordination.

Such a return to severity is fortunately checked in the seventh century. The Quinisext Council in Trullo (692) canonizes the letter of the clergy of Constantinople to Martyrius of Antioch by adopting it as its 95th canon, yet, significantly enough, it drops the sentence concerning reordinations. Timotheus of Constantinople in his *de receptione hæreticorum*, published 120 years after the Consultation of Martyrius, ignores again any claim to reordain Arians and Macedonians. He, too, sets up a triple classification of schisms and heresies. But his classification is most interesting. He does not even attempt to judge them individually on their theological demerits. His principle—a very sound one—classifies them roughly by their age. This does not mean that Monophysitism is less important theologically than Sabellianism. But it means that the sooner a sect has appeared and seceded from the "*Catholica*," the shorter its contact has been with the long life of Orthodoxy. For instance, Sabellianism has gone its own way first and the generations that have been reared since in Sabellianism are missing most of that Catholic and Orthodox tradition which developed after the secession of their founders. So no sacraments are accepted by the patriarch Timotheus from the older sects which left the Church in the second century: Montanists, Ennomians, Sabellians. Sects of the third and fourth centuries: Novatians, Arians, Macedonians see their baptism accepted. Sects of the fifth: Nestorians and Monophysites have their baptism and confirmation recognized. And although nothing is explicitly said of ordinations, there is no prescription for reordaining the first two classes and there is historical evidence that the orders of the third class were accepted.

[1] There is no doubt that here, too, the μυστικωτέρα χειροτονία βεβαιωθέντες alludes to Reconciliation, not to Reordination (*cf.* Saltet, p. 39).

But all this leniency does never suppress the fact and the necessity of an Economy through Reconciliation (Economy, Reconciliation, Penance, Reconfirmation, as we saw, are four synonyms). And again, such an Economy is never and can never be applied unless the Dissenter comes back first to faith and allegiance. If our offshoot has once chosen to be cut from the parent tree, to become its own master, and to turn wild, it may be true that all the features of the parent can never disappear completely from even the wildest offshoot. But it is just as true to add that the wild offshoot can never recover the full features of its parent again unless it is willing to submit to a graft from the parent tree.

NIKEPHOROS: A RETROSPECT.

By The Revd. D. J. Chitty.

INSISTENT, as an undergraduate, on a religion that should look wider and farther back than England, I had found Rome blocking the horizon. And though I had a dogged Anglican intuition of something more that must not be surrendered, it was fighting blindly in what seemed a losing battle against the imperiousness of Latin logic. After all, the Eastern Church had never been painted to me as having anything of unique importance for us. And though, at Oxford, I might be carried away, emotionally, by the robed assistance of two Eastern prelates at Mass at St. Mary's, my intellect remained definitely suspicious of diplomatic courtesies, and of anything which savoured of an alliance against Rome. I write this retrospect of my first real contact with Orthodoxy in the hope that others, too, on finding that unity with the East is no matter of easy attainment, may be encouraged thereby to think it the more worth attaining; and may realize that Orthodoxy has a distinctive and independent outlook which must at least be taken into account. If what first meets the eye has much in it that seems strange and even shocking, yet perhaps I may be able to suggest to the reader something of that bed-rocky realism which in the end converted me to find in it the norm of Christian faith and worship and life.

I reached Jerusalem after dark, by train from Jaffa in late October, 1925, after a long sea-voyage from England on a small boat. A priest on his way from the South African Railway Mission to an Oxford curacy was to celebrate in the Chapel of Abraham next morning. So it was in the early brightness of Friday that I first had sight of that strange world framed in the archway of the Damas-

cus Gate, and entered into its stepped and cobbled lanes and vaulted ways, its noise and bustle of camels and donkeys and men, the city whose memory, more than that of any other place on earth, is an ache in the heart of all who have loved it.

When we entered the Church, Latin Masses were being said in the Holy Sepulchre itself, and in the Franciscan Chapel, while the strange chanting of the Coptic Liturgy came from their altar at the west end of the Sepulchre. We waited till the Monk Nikephoros appeared to take us to the Chapel of Abraham, where the little bent old Russian woman acted as sacristan.

After our Mass, we went in again to pray in the Holy Sepulchre itself. Nikephoros reappeared, and pressed upon us a treatise on the Filioque in modern Greek.

That morning we went out to Bethlehem, and it was next day that I returned to be guided thoroughly round the Church of the Holy Sepulchre by Nikephoros. He proved an admirable guide—a peasant showing me each place with the same naïve store of accepted legend with which he would conduct a Balkan peasant pilgrim—finishing his story at each holy place with " And now you can pray." I took advantage of the permission, doing my best to adapt myself to his methods of devotion, in kissing of relics, and so forth : nor could it be there a mere outward show—though perhaps he may have remarked a certain amateurishness in the manner of my performance.

My Passion-centred Western outlook was a bit shocked to find Calvary seeming pushed to one side of the Church, and the Tomb central. It was the first suggestion that came to me of Orthodox Easter teaching. I had not then realized that what we call the Church of the Holy Sepulchre they regularly call the Church of the Resurrection—not the place of the dead, but the Fountain of New Life. Death is swallowed up in Victory.

Nikephoros offered to take me next week to Jericho and the Jordan—we would go down by car, and spend the night at one of the Greek Monasteries, returning the next day. So my first Wednesday in Palestine found me, after Mass and a hurried breakfast, at St. George's, waiting for Nikephoros in the Parvis of the Holy Sepulchre. I intended, for this expedition, to leave myself entirely in his hands and see what happened—a method which was, I think, justified by its results.

I had waited a quarter of an hour when, about 7.55, he appeared. He had walked down to Mar Saba the day before, and got up at midnight to walk back the three hours' journey through the Wilderness, to keep his appointment with me : he believed in keeping appointments : that was what he liked about Americans (this was a slip which slightly embarrassed him when, very quickly, he found that I was English). He had learnt English as a stoker on English

ships, on which he had visited London and Liverpool and Cardiff and Barry. Then he had worked on American ships, and in an hotel in New York, before becoming a monk.

We were walking back through the City to the Damascus Gate. There he set to work to bargain for a car to take us to Jericho, Jordan, and the Dead Sea, and back to Jericho for the night. The first we tackled suggested 250 piastres (£2 10s.)—if I remember rightly, that was the normal price paid by an Englishman at that time for a car to Jericho and back. Nikephoros would have none of it. By dint of considerable bargaining—which entailed our walking away several times as if we had decided to do without—he at last got one to agree to take us for one pound.

First we went to the New Gate, where Nikephoros went into the City to fetch some things from his convent. After some time he returned—without his things. A man bringing them—a sack containing all his worldly goods—had not yet appeared. Nikephoros went off again to look for him, and we sat waiting—the driver growing restive with the growing heat of the day in the dusty street. After about an hour, Nikephoros came back with the man and his goods. The man had, of course, gone to the Jaffa Gate instead of the New Gate: and Nikephoros had missed him when he first went to look there.

But now the driver began to haggle: to Jordan for a pound, certainly: but not to the Dead Sea as well: that would be twenty piastres extra. Nikephoros absolutely refused to allow me to agree to this. So, bag and baggage, we got out of the car, and I was left for another hour with my pack and Nikephoros' sack on that dusty pavement, while he went to look for another car. The contrast between the French and the English of a notice on a shop close by gave me food for bitter thought:—

LA TERRE SAINTE,
Objets de piété

Souvenirs & Curiosities
of the Holy Land.

At last Nikephoros returned with a cab: this would take us and our baggage back to the Damascus Gate, where we would get seats in a public car to Jericho: then we could either get a car on from there, or walk.

Having secured our seats, we waited for the best part of another hour for more passengers: Nikephoros lending me a copy of Νέα Σιὼν to while away the time, and buying a sort of honey-cake to eat, as he had had no food since the day before. At length, loaded

with Arabs, a Greek deacon, a Greek woman, and ourselves, the car set out across the Cedron, past Gethsemane, and up round the end of the Mount of Olives. Beyond Bethany (where Nikephoros pointed out to me the mosque over the Tomb of Lazarus), we plunged down by a series of hairpin bends into the Wilderness.

This Wilderness in October is at its starkest, and neither time nor the knowledge that others have seen it can lessen the amazement of the first journey through it—its scarred valleys, and appalling open desolations, and uncompromising brazen hills.

Mine host of the " Inn of the Good Samaritan " received from us a packet of cigarettes. Passing on again, we presently turned to the left on to a rougher road, with sharper plunges, in a country most admirably suited for the staging of that parable. The Jordan Valley was clearly not very far ahead, but not visible enough to destroy the sense of utter remoteness from all the world. At the very heart of this howling wilderness, in the glare of the mid-day heat, the car halted, and I was surprised to see Nikephoros taking off his baggage. We both got out, and the car went on.

Where he was taking me I did not know. The line of the Trans-jordanian mountains forming a general background to the east gave the sense of direction. Otherwise the view was fully occupied with the immediate surroundings—one of those strange irregular stretches where the hills are beginning to break down into valleys in rocky pyramids and pinnacles.

Nikephoros explained to me that we were going to his convent : he had not expected to bring me here, but the car coming by the old road to Jericho instead of the new, had brought us close to the convent.

No convent was in sight. A deep gorge lay to our left, and Nikephoros, with the sack containing all his worldly goods, led the way down a steep path that led back along its increasingly precipitous side. I followed with two tins which we were bringing to the convent as receptacles for water—trying in vain not to jar the tap attached to one of them against protruding rocks. The sand-like skin, which coats the tops of the desert hills, and which characterized the country up by the road, was here stripped away, leaving the bare skeleton of those brazen rocks reflecting upon us from every side the full heat of the noonday sun. Presently a great cliff was facing us, with white crosses painted on it, and inaccessible hermit paths and cells. Then, rounding another corner, we came into sight of the eagle's-nest convent of Chouziba itself, perched high up to the left of that cliff like some Tibetan Lamasery—and below it, up the very narrow gorge, were lovely green trees—bright green, not smothered in white dust like the olives of Jerusalem. And there was running water, not in the bed of the *wadi*, but in a little canal higher up our side of the gorge, just wide enough to make us lengthen our stride in

crossing it. The path led over it and down into the gorge, across the *wadi*-bed by a bridge, and up again by a rough zig-zag to the door at the eastern end of the convent. Here Nikephoros told me I was to be at home. He knocked at the worn iron door, and his companion (there were only the two monks living there then) came to open to us. Then there was water for me to wash my face and hands, in the hall which was serving as kitchen, wash-house, refectory, and everything else. My shirt was saturated with sweat, and Nikephoros insisted on producing me a change of raiment while it dried. Then there was a meal of coffee; marrow and egg-fruit, covered more than I appreciated with olive oil; figs, and the stumpy juicy yellow bananas which are distinctive of the Jordan Valley. Then, after a rest, was a bathe in the little canal opposite—basking flat in it so that the water just covered one. Then oranges, juicy and sweet though still green, from trees in the narrow ledge of lovely garden below.

Meanwhile Nikephoros was questioning me as to the use of leavened bread or unleavened in the Eucharist. How could we dare to use ἄ-ζυμα when the Scripture clearly said that Our Lord took ἄρτον, which could only mean leavened bread? If we pleaded that it was the Passover, St. Chrysostom had an explanation of that. At any rate, wafers were not bread. I pleaded for two ancient traditions—suggested we were following St. Paul—"the unleavened bread of sincerity and Truth"—though I saved myself just in time from the earlier part of the quotation—"the leaven of malice and wickedness." To this, as to most of my arguments, Nikephoros replied, "I don't understand," in a manner which precluded further discussion. On this point, I did not in the least know at that time that a scholar of such Latin sympathies as Professor Cuthbert Turner (to whose genial encouragement I largely owed my persistence in coming to Palestine) was clear that in the West as well as in the East leavened bread was the oldest use, azyms being an innovation not of earlier date than the time of Charlemagne.

We returned to the convent and sat on the balcony. Nikephoros was aged 42, with coarse dark hair and beard. He was born in Northern Greece, in a cottage of four rooms. His father, a labourer, had died when he was eleven, and there followed hard times for the family. When he was seventeen, he went down to the sea, and became a stoker on a Greek ship. Then he transferred to English ships, then to American. But at the age of thirty he sent his savings home to his mother, and went to Athos. He had been six years there, and now six years in Palestine. He did not, on that occasion, tell me that on leaving Athos he had left the monastic life, returned to the sea, and gone to Australia before coming to Jerusalem. The other Greeks, as I gathered years later, were a little embarrassed lest I should regard him as typical of their Church and people—they themselves regarded him as "slightly touched." Yet I still do not

think that I could have had a better introduction to the background of Orthodoxy than this peasant, half-monk, half-tramp, an embodiment of all the folk-lore of a Church which is absolutely and unashamedly a Church of the people. When I last heard of him, in 1929, he was back in Boston.

He produced me a book of sayings of the Desert Fathers. I opened it at random, and hit upon the story of the monk afflicted with accidie, who determined to go away from his monastery to escape from the devil: as he was putting on his sandals, he looked up and saw another putting on his sandals also: "Wherever thou goest, there I go before thee": the enemy was not to be escaped from so easily.

The bell soon rang for Vespers, and I went in to Church with the two monks, occupying a stall at the side of the Church while they carried through the service. It was the first time that I had been at a Greek service. I was still unfamiliar with the proper pronunciation of Greek, and could follow but little. In the heat and the weariness a strange desolation came upon me. What was the meaning of this dry nasal chant, these interminable gabbled Kyrie eleisons? Could reality be here? But if not, would it not mean that Christian Faith was only a convenience, a means to good living, and not an end to be pursued absolutely for its own sake? I wrote it off as ordinary questioning of the reality of forms and ceremonies. But underneath, if only half-realized, a deeper questioning had been aroused. I was beginning to be faced with the implications of Christian Faith accepted in unmitigated realism.

After the service, Nikephoros showed me fragments of sixth-century mosaic on the floor of the Church, including part of an inscription—"Friend of man, remember Thy servant——." He showed me the cheap wood of the temporary stalls and Ikonostasis—all the former wookwork had been burnt by the Turks when they wantonly sacked the monastery in their retreat in 1917. He showed me also another little chapel behind—both it and the Church surmounted, as usual, by domes.

The monastery dates back to fifth-century hermits, though its first great organizer was St. John of Chouziba, who became Metropolitan of Cæsarea in the early sixth century. The St. George whose name it now bears was a monk there at the time of the Persian invasion in A.D. 614. Frescoes and holes for beams on the cliff-face over the gates of the monastery show the position of an earlier church, now fallen away into the gorge below. Probably there have always been a few hermits frequenting the valley; but the organized monastery dwindled away in the course of the Middle Ages, to be refounded during the latter half of last century, at a time when it seems that Russian money was helping a large revival of Greek monasticism in Palestine.

We sat on the balcony till approaching dusk showed it was time for Compline, after which we had some tea. It was now dark, and the moon was risen. Nikephoros was interspersing his life-story with questions about the phases of the moon, and accounts of how, at the Second Coming, the Cross will be the first to return—will appear in the sky twenty yards above Calvary, and all the Jews in the world will see it and mourn. He was very tired, and soon went to bed. I stayed for some time looking out from the balcony on the moon and the cliffs, and the trees of the garden in the foot of the gorge.

I chose what seemed the softer, though less magnificent, of the two beds in my room (I seem to have thought it was sprung, but I can hardly believe that). At three o'clock I woke to the clanging of the bell, and saw a light go past my door—but the flesh was weak. When I got up about six o'clock, their service was just finishing.

We breakfasted off coffee, black bread and bananas. Nikephoros had brought some bread from Jerusalem which was comparatively soft. The bread of the convent needed a hammer—though wholesome enough if moistened. In the bright early morning, Nikephoros took me all over the convent. We went up the stairs, and he showed me his own room, once the refectory, with its seven windows smashed by the Turks. He had roughly blocked three with stones, but was badly wanting money to glaze the other four before winter: no, it was difficult to get money out of the Patriarchate, though they were rich: he himself had no funds.

We came out on to the roof, whereon is the state-room which once held the library, and a bed for the Patriarch on his visitations—with a window looking down from it into the church. Here, too, bed and library had been burnt, and windows smashed. Behind, under the overhanging rock, was the tomb of the monk who had refounded the monastery—even its inscribed marble slab had been smashed.

At the back of the roof is a cave-church, with a white curtain spread over its entrance. Here, I was told, Elijah was fed by the ravens: and here old Joachim came to pray for a child for his wife Anna, and received by Gabriel the promise of the best of children.

We came out of the convent, and a little way down the valley to a door in the cliff, which Nikephoros unlocked, revealing a cave with rows of skulls about it, paved with slabs only half-covering the old graves filled with masses of bones (the practice is to bury the bodies elsewhere for three years, then to exhume the bones, and bring them to the cave). An English lady in Jerusalem—no lover of human skeletons—told me, later, how once, as a special privilege, Nikephoros had brought her here: he had picked up one of the skulls, and gently stroked it—"Didn't God make it beautifully?"! The

walls and ceiling were roughly plastered, black with the smoke of innumerable candles, and covered with old red Crosses, Greek inscriptions old and new, and—strange juxtaposition!—English names scribbled on by the British or Australian soldiers who came upon this valley in the 1917 advance.

We returned to the monastery for my pack, went again for a moment into the church, said good-bye to the other monk, and set out down the gorge, keeping this time to the path on its northern side. This was rather rougher than the one by which we had come the day before. Winding down the gorge, we saw below us in its sides many ruins of cells and lesser convents. At last, rounding a corner of rock, we saw ahead the brilliant green of the Oasis of Jericho, with the shining Plain of Jordan, and the Transjordanian Mountains blue beyond, framed in the V of the gorge. Coming out to where the valley debouched on the sandy plain, we veered round to the left, and continued northwards, a little below the meeting of mountain and sand, with the roofs and domes and minaret of Jericho, and its green well-watered gardens down to our right, and the great sandy mound of Old Jericho ahead.

Conversation continued. Why did we keep the Filioque? that was an alteration of the Creed, and there was an old anathema against any alteration in it. The Son and the Spirit were to the Father as two arms (this is a line of thought as old as Irenæus, but Nikephoros did not seem very sure of it, and let it drop when he saw I was not finding it quite satisfactory). The Scripture said "Which proceedeth from the Father": why did we not keep to Scripture? If we must say something of the Spirit's relation to the Son, Scripture had it ready for us: we could say "Proceeding from the Father, and sent by the Son." I vainly tried to argue that that was what we really meant, even if we didn't say it—that our English "Proceeding from" does not have the same suggestion as the Greek "ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ." Nikephoros retired into "I don't understand." I should say that I do not now regard this line of defence as tenable. I firmly believe that our intention is Orthodox. But, historically speaking, "proceeding" is the translation of "ἐκπορευόμενον," and must bear the responsibility of that in the face of the Church Universal. And our Creed is our confession of Faith in the face of the Church Universal, and not merely our private confession within England. Viewed in this light, I cannot personally to-day regard the Filioque as other than a badge of Schism, the erasure of which from our Creed and Litany is bound to follow (not as a sop to the Orthodox, but on the merits of the case in itself) on the full recognition by our Church of its real historical and doctrinal signification.

The question of the Papacy also arose. I tried to stand out for a "Primacy of Honour," but Nikephoros did not want this. Why

need we think that Peter's authority was passed on to his successors? Even if it was, was he not Bishop of Antioch before ever he went to Rome?

We were veering a bit to the left to keep above Old Jericho, and presently came round into sight of the great cliff of the Mountain of the Temptation, with its conical wall-enclosed peak, towering above us. The monastery, perched half-way up the cliff—larger, and perched far higher than Chouziba—was to me all the more startling as I had not had the preparation of the distant view which one gets in the approach from Jericho. We came up a rise in the ground, crossed a stream of running water in which we were delighted to wash our faces and hands; then over a ridge, and round to the left beside the fence of the wide green monastery farm, edged with cypresses, that lies at the foot of the cliff. Soon we were toiling, very hot, up the zig-zag path, gradually getting steeper as the lower slopes pass up into precipice, and at last sat down for a moment's rest upon the doorstep of the monastery. Then up some steps at the head of which, beside the door of the guest-room, the old Archimandrite Avramios stood waiting to greet us. He took us into the guest-room, and brought us *arak* (my first acquaintance with that strange and potent liquor), followed by coffee. The cushioned divan round the room, and the coloured pictures of our King and Queen, of old King George of Greece and his queen, and of various Orthodox prelates, made it clear that this monastery was considerably richer than Chouziba—a fact which Nikephoros was quite ready for me to appreciate.

Avramios, a native of the Peloponnese, had refounded the monastery some forty years before, and ruled it ever since: a little bowed man, a past master in the art of gesticulation, and at the same time with a wonderful dignity. I began to realize the amazing power these Greek monks have of being in place in their surroundings, and to learn how deeply conscious they were of natural beauty. It was beginning to dawn on me how, even when his execution was at its most execrable, the Greek had never lost that mastery of composition which ancient Hellas had discovered, and which the Early Church had turned to her service and directed heavenwards—that which gives Agia Sophia a harmony and unity which no Gothic Cathedral can show.

Avramios talked a lot—with actions suited to his words—to Nikephoros. Then, using him as interpreter, he began to question me on the doctrine and practice of the Church of England. What was our practice in regard to Confession? Did we baptize by immersion or like the Latins? (Disdainfully he went through the motions of baptism by affusion: then, with emphatic force, through those of the trine immersion.) Did we use bread or azyma in the Eucharist? Did we mix the warm water with the Consecrated Chalice? Why

did we not like kissing the Ikons? He was careful to explain that you kiss an ikon just as you might kiss the photograph of someone you love. As for the Latins, with their solid images, they were idolaters. This distinction between solid and flat image seemed to me far-fetched at the time. I have since come to see that there lies behind it a distinction of real psychological, and therefore religious, importance. In general, I was distressed at the impression that their attitude was made rigid and exclusive by hatred of Rome. Proud in intellectual western notions of development, Unity in Diversity, etc., I was distressed at the complete absence from their minds of any such idea. No, for them, the Church was in everything as it had always been since the days of the Apostles.

And for all that, was I not very much at home with these monks? Had it begun to dawn on me that all our high-flown theories are useless until their foundation is laid on the bed-rock of the knowledge of the undying Church which this simple people's faith has kept for its treasure—its stewardship on behalf of all the world.

At least some questions were dawning on me. The leavened bread: the Chalice not withheld from the Laity: solid images rejected: Scripture constantly appealed to: could it possibly be more than an accident that on all these points on which the sixteenth-century reformers attacked Rome, the East also differed from Rome and criticized her. Might the same, perhaps, be true of matters not so near the surface also?

The main part of the monastery consists of a corridor between the cliff and a row of balconied cells. At the far end, we came to the church, the western half of which is a deep cave. Up some stairs on its south side, we came to a little altar in a recess in the cliff, with a stone underneath, on which, I was told, our Lord sat for the forty days of the Temptation. Above it was a picture, and a notice in English—the short Marcan account of the Temptation, followed by the words

"THIS IS THE PLACE, GENTLEMEN."

We came back to a meal in the refectory—a soup full of a large solid sort of lentil, with olive oil poured over it, and lemon-juice sprinkled on for relish. Of this, egg-fruit, and white goat's-milk cheese, I ate as much as I could stomach—but took refuge, mainly, in black bread. After the meal, we rested in the guest-room. The deacon and woman who had been with us in the car the day before were there, and Nikephoros, finding that they were going to Jordan next day, suggested that we should wait and go with them. To this I agreed.

A monk looked out from the balcony, and turned round announcing, "Francopateres." A large train of donkeys carrying Franciscans

was coming up the path towards the monastery. Vespers was put off while they were courteously entertained to *arak* and coffee. Might they have the key, and go on up to the top of the mountain? Oh, but they would find that too difficult a climb—very steep and rough. So they retired, having penetrated no farther than the church. After Vespers, Nikephoros quickly fetched the key, and we went out of the south door of the monastery, and up the "steep rough path" to the top, unlocked the door of the enclosure, and went in. Foundations of a church which Avramios had started to build before the War, and never had funds to finish, lie among masses of stone from older buildings—a church built by St. Helena, I was told, though her connection with churches in Palestine or Egypt is generally rather less reliable than that of King Arthur with localities in Wales or Cornwall. A row of rooms is built along the south side of the enclosure, and on their roof we sat. The picture framed itself for me as it drew on towards sunset. To the west, the wilderness of mountain stretching up to the two distant towers of Olivet. To the far north, a dim hill which might have been Hermon. Below us, the great width of the Plain of Jordan—the Oasis of Jericho, then the shining flat plain, then the marl cliffs and dunes falling away into the jungle of Jordan's flood-bed: the white walls of the two monasteries of St. John Baptist and St. Gerasimus, and between them, farther away, the tall cypresses marking the place of pilgrimage where the waters of Jordan are blessed at Epiphany. Stretching away beyond sight to the south, the beauty of the Dead Sea. And the constant line of the Transjordanian Mountains behind. In front, the gaunt figure of the shabby, black-robed monk, all skin and bone, sitting on the wall like an ikon of the Fast.

We went down to the monastery for supper (at which I managed a little better with the lentil soup). Then followed Compline, in the church lit with candles. We kissed the Saints good night, and came out to sit for a little while on the balcony outside the refectory —sheer cliff, dropping away for hundreds of feet below us: a few lights in Jericho: Bedawin fires blazing up here and there across the Plain: and the full moon risen over Moab. Here were half a dozen peasant monks, whom the centuries cannot alter, ardently questioning me as to the doctrine of the English Church. (Would that our people had that same zeal for the Faith, that same consciousness of God and His Saints as known personally in the worship of the Church, that same knowledge that in the end there is an opening for every man, whatever his position, capacity, or education, to give his whole life directly to the service of God in His Church.) Did we believe that the Holy Virgin was Theotokos? Did we accept her Perpetual Virginity? As to the latter question, I felt bound in honesty to confess the lamentable vague carelessness common among Anglicans. Nikephoros turned to me. "I believe

it," he said, " I believe it so strongly, that if Jesus Christ Himself were to tell me that the Virgin Mary had other children, I should not believe Him ! "

I slept that night on a boarded bed in a balconied cell. At 3.30 came the clashing of the bell, and this time I hurriedly slipped on my clothes and went along to the church. But after I had vainly struggled for half an hour to keep my head from falling on my chest, Nikephoros whispered to me that I need not be there, and I returned to bed. When I woke again, the red dawn was in glory over Moab. But even that could not thoroughly rouse me from snatching a few minutes more rest.

After a light breakfast of bread and coffee, and a last visit to the church, we bade farewell to the monks—Avramios wishing me *bon voyage*—and set out down the mountain : the burly deacon John Stavrides (a native of Salonika) from the convent at Bethlehem ; the Greek woman ; a young monk who proved to be her son ; Nikephoros, and myself. Two donkeys passed us on their way up to the convent. Reaching the farm, we washed our faces in the water. The deacon plucked a sprig of sweet basil, and gave it me. He also produced a bottle of *arak*, with swigs from which we were regaled at intervals throughout the journey. We greeted the monk who looks after the farm, and went on, by Old Jericho, to Elisha's Pool, of the waters of which they drank eagerly. Then we walked down the tree-lined road to Jericho. We came to the Greek church with Zacchæus' Tree outside it, and there the priest of the church treated us to whisky and coffee. Then we went and sat in an inn, where again we had coffee, and waited in vain hopes of a car to take us to Jordan. Conversation between the monks and mine host turned to reminiscences of 1917—strange picture of the monks up in that eagle's nest watching the war below them ! A gramophone was produced, and (for my supposed pleasure) their only two English records—" God Save the King " and " Yes, we have no bananas " !

About eleven o'clock, we had lunch—I indulging in the luxury of three fried eggs (which the monks could not have, as it was Friday), some bread, and some beer. After lunch, Nikephoros and I walked round to the garden of his Superior (now, as in the sixth century, almost every church or monastery seems to have a garden in that green oasis). The Superior was there, and fed us on a melon, of the colour and taste of an apricot, from a plant which, he said, was brought from Colombo, and bore fruit all the year round.

About three o'clock, we decided to walk to Jordan. It transpired that in the morning the woman's son had refused a car which would have taken us all for eighty piastres, because he thought that it should not be more than sixty.

We hired a donkey for his mother, and set out into the desert plain. Presently we were in a region covered with long-spined

thorn-bushes—the same, I was told, from which the Crown of Thorns was made. After a time a tree was seen lonely to our left—where the angel appeared to Joshua—as angels would appear in such a place. The sun was hot, and the plain very wide; the soil a kind of firmly-clotted sand.

Across our path came a vast herd of camels going southwards in long procession, unladen except for the leader, with little ones, and here and there a herdsman.

Presently the bush grew larger. The dome of St. Gerasimus was away to our right, and that of St. John ahead of us—with the line of cypresses farther away between them.

Then we came out on to a stretch of flat bare open desert, the monastery passing for a time out of sight. Then, as the sun was setting magnificent behind the two towers of Olivet, we came to where the plain breaks down in dunes to the jungle, and saw the monastery close ahead of us. The Greeks spontaneously broke into chanting (that chant whose strong unemotional persistence, and wonderful harmony with all creation round it, was already, perhaps, beginning to work its work upon me). I asked Nikephoros what they were singing, and he told me it was St. John of Damascus' hymn of the Epiphany (it is, in fact, the Dismissal Hymn of that Feast). Roughly, and with complete and lamentable loss of the rhythm and feeling of the original, it may be translated thus:—

In Jordan when Thou wast baptized, O Lord,
Was shown the worship of the Three in One.
The Father's voice in witness from above
Named Thee beloved Son.
And bodied as a dove,
The Spirit sealed the sureness of that word.
O Christ, Our God made manifest,
The world that lightenest,
Glory to Thee.

Winding through the dunes to the door of the convent, we were greeted by dogs barking, chickens, and turkeys. A man and woman, answering our knock, told us that the Archimandrite (Panaretos) was down by the river. So, leaving the donkey, we walked across to find him in a place of wicker booths beside Jordan, with steps down to the stream, and a little quay for boats. I dabbled my feet from the steps, and we sat round a table, and talked, and drank Jordan water, as the full moon rose, and the night drew on.

Supper that night back in the monastery was a feast—tinned salmon, tomatoes, and rice. We kissed the Ikons before going to bed (in the great church which was completely destroyed in the earthquake of 1927). But there was no clashing bell to call us to

church at three o'clock. Panaretos was, in fact, the only monk there, the convent being more of a hostel for pilgrims than a real monastery.

Down by the river in the morning, Panaretos held that most beautiful service of the Blessing of the Waters: then the Cross which had been dipped with sweet herbs in the river was held for us to kiss, and the water from the herbs sprinkled on our heads.

We returned for our things, and walked back over the hot desert to Jericho, where presently we said good-bye to Nikephoros, and a car took the deacon, the monk's mother, and myself, back to Jerusalem.

I had been away for three nights, when I had only planned for one. So perhaps it was not surprising to find, on return to St. George's, that Canon Danby had just been telephoning to the police—a certain man had gone down from Jerusalem to Jericho—and had not come back.

NEWS OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES

JUGOSLAVIA.

IN September there was celebrated in Belgrade, King Peter II's first birthday since his accession on the tragic death of King Alexander.

The event was marked by a special thanksgiving service in Belgrade Cathedral, at which were present Prince Paul the Regent, all the leading men in the Kingdom, the members of the Diplomatic Corps and representatives of the different confessions.

His Holiness the Patriarch Varnava delivered a striking sermon, which was broadcast. He began by referring to the Providence of God, Who controls history and Whose will it is that men should serve Him in the conditions of life in which He has placed them. The Patriarch expressed his joy at the courage and determination of the young King, who had given up the idyll of life in an English college in order to return to his own land to prepare himself for his arduous and difficult work as king. His Holiness dealt fully with the dangers surrounding Jugoslavia—the only recently removed age-old political separation of portions of the Jugoslav people from each other, the terrible blood-feuds even within the nation, the religious differences, the party strife, the post-war crisis in religion and morality. But his final message was one of encouragement and hope. All should rally round the only real centre of national life,

the King of the Karageorgevitch Dynasty. Without distinction of faith or race, they should ask God to bless the Royal House and resolve to serve their country with all their power and devotion. (From *Glasnik*.)

* * * * *

The following interesting account is taken from the journal of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Belgrade: during a recent pastoral visitation of a number of villages inhabited by Catholic Croats, the Archbishop passed through Novi Grad, in which dwell Orthodox Serbs. To his amazement the Archbishop was greeted with shouts of joy by the villagers and their priest, who asked for his blessing. The Archbishop was deeply moved, gave them his blessing and said to them: "It is my firm belief that Serbs and Croats are brethren and should love one another. The Apostle said: 'Everything shall pass away, faith and hope, but there will remain love.'" Then His Grace embraced the Orthodox priest and all the Croats and Serbs, following his example, embraced each other. (From *Glasnik*)

* * * * *

RUMANIA.

A distinguished recruit to Rumanian monasticism, Alexander Nicov, a graduate in Theology, of the University of Chisinau and a post-graduate student at Strasbourg, Paris, London and Beyrout (Syria), at present studying for his Doctorate in Theology at the University of Cernauti, has taken his monastic vows. (From *Misionarul*.)

Nicov was present last year at an Anglo-Orthodox student conference in England, and spent some months in the country as the guest of a number of English friends. He is a regular contributor to *Misionarul*, the well-known journal of the Rumanian Home Mission Movement.

* * * * *

RAPORT GENERAL CULTURAL, RAPORT GENERAL ADMINISTRATIV, RAPORT GENERAL ECONOMIC,

for the years 1932-5, of the Central Church Council, presented to the National Church Congress of the Patriarchate of Rumania, October 14th, 1935.

These three beautifully printed and attractively produced booklets give an impartial and exhaustive account of the life of the Rumanian

Church during the last few years and make exceedingly heartening reading.

The population of Rumania is now 18,791,637, of which 15,287,047 inhabit the country and 3,533,590 the towns. Of these 12,375,850 are Orthodox, divided into 8,474 parishes in 18 dioceses. The priests number 8,542, of which 7,868 are paid by the State.

The most important activity of the Church is at present internal missionary work. Through its cultural links with Western Europe on the one hand and its proximity to Soviet Russia on the other, Rumania finds itself exposed to decadent and irreligious influences of various kinds. Against these a fierce campaign has been started by the Church, with many different organizations according to the particular type catered for, peasant, town worker, intellectual, etc. Until the economy cuts of a year or two back, every diocese had its own special missioner, paid by the State. Now many dioceses support their own. The majority have started numerous missionary circles conducted by priests who give their services free. The diocese of Ramnic, for example, has 54 priests working in this way in different sections of the diocese. Unfortunately, as a result of the world-wide economic depression, Rumania had to make drastic cuts in the Budget, and the State-paid clergy suffered very much. But in spite of this they have not relaxed their missionary effort. A whole multitude of organizations have sprung into being, among which special mention must be made of the movements led by students from the universities of Bucarest and Chisinau, and of such groups as "The National Orthodox Society of Rumanian Women," "The Society of St. George" for young people of all kinds, and "The Army of the Lord" for every type of Orthodox and adapted according to locality. All these organizations work by means of talks, followed by questions; study circles; devotional meetings; special services; printing and distribution of literature; cultural and recreational meetings, etc., in a manner familiar to us in England. Other methods of spreading Christianity have been the observation of a Special Sunday for Mothers, a Special Sunday against Alcohol, and the founding of groups in which the healthier sides of Rumanian artistic production have been studied to offset the influence of so much modern decadence in the guise of culture.

Of particular interest is the question of religion in the schools. The Rumanian Church has now obtained the right for the clergy to give religious instruction in nearly every school in the country, and a fair amount of the "Raport General Cultural" is taken up with the problem of how this may best be done.

Philanthropic institutions have also sprung up all over the country, and in the diocese of Bucarest alone the annual amount spent on charity is between five and six million lei.

Study circles have been formed among the clergy, with the aim

of keeping them in touch with the Christian solution to the problems of the modern world. These have been well attended, and varied in size from a meeting of the clergy of an entire diocese to a gathering of half a dozen parish priests.

The recent visit of the Anglican delegation to Bucarest is referred to with great joy as one of the outstanding events in the history of the Rumanian Church, and deep satisfaction is expressed that between this delegation and the representatives of the Patriarch there was complete agreement.

Worthy of note also is the appearance of a new edition of the Bible in modern Rumanian. So far all the books of the Old Testament have been printed, and the New Testament will be issued shortly.

The tasks of the immediate future would appear to be the production of solid, scholarly works on Christian theology and philosophy (is it too presumptuous to think that here the Anglican Church might be of value ?) ; the settling of the question as to how far the clergy should be supported by the State ; the adaptation of the age-old ecclesiastical organization to meet the conditions of life in a modern State, *e.g.*, the possibility of active religious orders, the need of a sound secular as well as religious training for the clergy ; and, very important, the solution of the sectarian troubles in Bessarabia, caused, at least in part, by the difficult problem of the Russian racial minority.

The Rumanian Church is now one of the most important in the Orthodox world. If it goes forward as it has done in the last few years, its service to Orthodoxy and to the entire Christian world should be very great.

OUR BOOKSHELF

A HISTORY OF THE RUMANIANS FROM ROMAN TIMES TO THE COMPLETION OF UNITY.

By R. W. Seton-Watson, D.Litt., Ph.D., F.B.A.
(Cambridge University Press. 25s.)

RUMANIAN Church history is now coming to be eagerly studied by Anglicans. There is a growing consciousness of the rising importance and strategetic position of this Church, Orthodox, yet with many linguistic and cultural links with the Latin West of Europe. And Professor Seton-Watson's new work will be invaluable.

He provides us first of all with an exhaustive account of the past

history of the Rumanians and of the peoples surrounding them, thus helping us to understand the causes of the tangled and bitter national rivalries which have had their repercussions in the religious sphere. Every serious protagonist of ecclesiastical reunion, as well as everyone who dreams of a supra-national Danube state, will find much food for thought in the account of the long persecution of the Roumanian Orthodox in Transylvania (then part of the Hungarian lands) by the Three Recognized Nations (Magyar, Szechel and Saxon), with their Four Received Religions (Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed and Unitarian). The unwavering, obstinate Orthodoxy of the almost completely illiterate, subject Rumanian masses (in spite of a section of them becoming Uniate), deprived of their natural leaders' (the nobles as a rule became quickly Magyar in culture and Roman Catholic in religion), will arouse his deep admiration and give him an excellent background for an unprejudiced study of racial and religious minorities in present-day Great Roumania. And the indomitable figure of the great Metropolitan Shaguna, erudite, courageous and a brilliant ecclesiastical statesman, untiring in his efforts for his flock against Magyar tyranny and widespread ignorance, will remain sharp and clear against the grim background of the time.

Professor Seton-Watson is, of course, concerned mainly with the constitutional development of the Roumanian people (his description of the interplay of political forces during the Balkan Wars and the Great War, for example, is an amazingly fine account). Yet he always gives a full picture of the activity of the Church as a vital strand in the national life. In any case, religion and politics are so intermingled in East Europe that a full understanding of the latter is essential for a balanced appreciation of the former. The persistence of Old Slavonic, as the language of the Liturgy until the middle of the eighteenth century can only be understood when the importance of the Old Bulgarian Empire has been realized ; and Phanariot clerical influence and even the substitution of Roumanian for Slavonic or Greek (the Phanariot clergy abolished Slavonic, and since the Rumanian clergy did not understand Greek, reluctantly permitted the use of Roumanian in the services) can only be appreciated on a background of Turkish history, when the Phanariot Greeks became the trusted intermediaries of the Porte in both religious and secular affairs.

And what are we to think of the position of the Rumanian Church to-day ? The answer might be found in a recent copy of *Misionarul*, the organ of the Home Mission Movement in Roumania, where the visit of a delegation of Anglican bishops and theologians is regarded with legitimate pride as a recognition of the growing importance of Bucharest as a centre of Orthodoxy. Constantinople has done so much for the Church ; so has Moscow ; the time has now come when

Rumania, in the full flood of national and spiritual awakening after the union of all her children under one sceptre, is to play a leading part in the life of the Church and to bring her own special contribution to the ever-growing treasury of Orthodox spirituality.

E.N.C.S.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.

By Sergius Bulgakov.

(The Centenary Press. 8s. 6d.)

An edition of this work appeared in French a few years ago with the title of *l'Orthodoxie*, but this version, as the Preface informs us, has been corrected and enlarged from the original Russian manuscript.

In many ways this is a brilliant and memorable book, written with a serenity that is very refreshing in these days of theological agitation. Particularly noteworthy is the chapter on Tradition, in which Fr. Bulgakov, basing himself on Khomiakov, shows clearly the eternal basis of Orthodoxy as freedom in the Spirit and, over against Catholic rationalism and Protestant subjectivism, declares that the final criterion of truth is the Holy Spirit working through the whole Church.

The chapter on the Orthodox Church Service, explaining as it does a world of spiritual beauty almost unknown in the West, is particularly to be recommended to non-Orthodox.

Perhaps the most important section of the book is the chapter on Orthodoxy and the State, in which the author examines with a rare and moving impartiality the advantages and disadvantages of an Orthodox Empire (quoting examples from Russian history), and of the modern alternative of disestablishment.

But on some of the other subjects with which he deals Fr. Bulgakov is less trustworthy. The exaggerated importance given to the Mother of God is particularly unfortunate, as it will appear to lend support to the wildest Protestant accusations of excess in this matter and alienate many who would otherwise be profoundly affected by the Orthodox teaching about the Saints. So too we cannot but regret such statements as that on page 124: "In masculine and feminine nature humanity possesses a double aspect of its spiritual existence . . . these correspond to the figures of the second and third hypostasis (of the Trinity)."

Moreover, Fr. Bulgakov's teaching on Eschatology contains

doubtful elements. He would appear to have abandoned the idea of a catastrophic Second Coming at any time.

The translation is on the whole very good. But it should have been possible to avoid reference to the Holy Spirit as " It " (page 10), and translations from the service books make no attempt to reproduce the sonorous beauty of the original.

Fr. Bulgakov's book, if used with caution, is of great value to all students of the Orthodox Church, but it is much to be regretted that the author did not allow himself to be guided more by the spirit of the great Russian Dogmatic theologian and ecclesiastical historian Makary, Metropolitan of Moscow. The latter's *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe* was drawn on with telling effect a few years ago by Gala Galaction in Roumania (see his *Piatradin-Capul-Unghiului*), and might have given to Fr. Bulgakov's book a much greater accuracy and usefulness.

E.N.C.S.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE LESSER EASTERN CHURCHES.

SIR,

THE old adage that "the whirligig of time brings its own revenge," is one which like so many others is only half a truth. In no case is this more potent than in the controversies of the Early Church. They are only too often regarded as virtual dead letters. But they probably remain only in a state of suspended animation. I am only concerned in this article with one of them, and that probably the greatest, certainly the most far-reaching and one which is in my humble judgment intimately bound up with the problem of Christian Reunion. " How far back in history is it necessary to go, to find what is somewhat loosely called ' The Undivided Church ? ' " Neither 1549, nor 1054 will do, for each appeals to some time preceding them. No, we have to go back to as early as A.D., 461 for the middle of the fifth century marks the beginning of schism, and from that time onward, the external unity of the Church was definitely broken. The schisms of earlier days were but transitory, and did not affect the Church's external unity, but the year A.D., 461 saw the disastrous schism, which split the unity of Eastern Christendom in twain. Of course, as is so often the case in the East, religious dissensions, national jealousies, and political aspirations were hope-

lessly intermingled and in the process, it was by no means easy to tell who was in the right. The controversy was known as Monophysitism, and it was intimately bound up with a Council, the Council of Chalcedon in A.D., 451 known to a very large section of Christendom as the Fourth General Council. Any efforts to promote unity especially in the East, will be compelled to take both the heresy of Monophysitism, and the Council of Chalcedon into consideration. I cannot deny a conviction which I am desirous of stating at this point, and that is this, "That it is only upon the basis of the Principles of Faith and Order of the Primitive Church, that reunion can be accomplished." In the Providence of God during the last 70 years, the Anglican and Eastern Churches, especially the Orthodox, having been gradually growing together towards mutual understanding, and progress has been greatly accelerated since the Lambeth Conference of 1920. Yet with all the progress made, and none appreciates the fact more than myself, the Eastern Orthodox Church does not represent the whole of Eastern Christendom. There are the Lesser Eastern Churches to be considered, and also the Uniat Bodies, the latter, of course, in communion with Home, who presumably will not expect them to deal with reunion matters apart from herself. It is with the former of these two that I propose to deal. With the possible exceptions of the Coptic and Abyssinian Churches, the Anglican Church has official relations with each of them. Yet there can, I think, be no reunion apart from their relation to the Orthodox Church. What must inevitably be done is for the Orthodox and the Lesser Eastern Churches to grow together towards a mutual understanding, as the Anglican and Orthodox Churches are doing. It is not policy to regard the Orthodox Church and the Lesser Eastern Churches apart from each other; and to ignore the existence of the Monophysite heresy, however limited it may be in range, as well as the implications of the Council of Chalcedon, is simply to blind oneself to vital issues. The Monophysite heresy means that Christ, being the Son of God, could not, therefore, become Man, He could not have two natures, He could not have a human soul. And this preposterous theory was accepted as true by a very great proportion of Eastern Christendom, in spite of the fact that it can be shown to be clean, contrary to the teaching of Holy Scripture. The Council of Chalcedon was called to deal with this and similar heresies existing at the time. The Lesser Eastern Churches rejected, and still reject to-day the decrees of that Council, and of the three which followed it, which are regarded by the Orthodox as Œcumenical. How can a reconciliation of the two viewpoints be made? How can the Decrees of the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th General Councils be explained, to make them acceptable to the Lesser Eastern Churches? There was at the time one factor to be considered, which has no longer any force, namely the desire,

a by no means inexcusable desire, of Constantinople to impose its own Hellenic culture on the whole of Eastern Christianity, and the consequent reaction of non-Hellenic cultures, expressed by the other Eastern Churches, to that policy of Hellenization ; but that desire no longer exists. The more or less satisfactory settlement of the Arabaphone question in the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, is sufficient evidence of this. I believe it can be done, if the will to do it is sufficiently strong. Much explanation and discussion will be needed, much willingness to forget ancient animosities, and a great desire to find a position agreeable to both. The controversy of the fifth century, conceived in bitterness, and crystallized by 1,500 years of prejudice cannot be rooted out in a day, but that an outworn heresy should permanently divide Eastern Christendom is unthinkable. And here the Anglican Church, holding out hands of friendship and brotherhood to both Orthodox and Separated alike, can in the Providence of God, be the instrument of Unity. Let us pray and work to be the instruments for bringing Anglican, Orthodox and Separated Eastern to be one, not only in the Spirit, but also in the Body. " For there is One Body and One Spirit, even as ye are called in One hope of your calling ; One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One God and Father of us all."

H. C. KERRIGAN.